

DISCOURSES

ON THE

FOUR GOSPELS,

Chiefly with Regard to the peculiar DESIGN of each,
And the ORDER and PLACES in which they were written.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

An INQUIRY concerning the HOURS
OF ST. JOHN, OF THE ROMANS,

AND OF SOME OTHER

NATIONS OF ANTIQUITY.

By THOMAS TOWNSON, B. D.

RECTOR of MALPAS, CHESHIRE; and late FELLOW of MAGDALEN
COLLEGE, OXFORD.

MIRABILIA TESTIMONIA TUA, IDEO
SCRUTATA EST EA ANIMA MEA.

PSAL. CXIX. V. 129.

O X F O R D.

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS. MDCCLXXVIII.

Sold by CHARLES BATHURST, in Fleet-Street, London;
and by DANIEL PRINCE, in Oxford.

IMPRIMATUR,

GEO. HORNE,



Vice - Can. Oxon.

Nov. 10, 1777.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Author of these Discourses has considered the subject which they treat of with some care and attention, and so as to satisfy himself, that all material parts of the work rest on a good foundation. Yet he had not now ventured to lay his thoughts before the Public, but in pure deference to the judgment of two or three very valuable and learned friends, who have perused these papers and urged the printing of them. He will be happy that he has submitted to their advice, if his humble endeavours prove subservient to the cause of truth ; if they tend in any measure to illustrate the Gospels, and to confirm the evidence of their authenticity—He has only to add his sincere thanks to one of these friends, who has been so kind as to undertake the whole trouble of the publication.

ADVERTISEMENT

THE Author of this Dissertation has considered the subject which was first of with some care and attention, and is so to satisfy himself, that all material parts of the work are on a good foundation. Yet he had not now ventured to lay his thoughts before the Public, but in pure obedience to the judgment of the learned and judicious friends, who have perused these papers and urged the printing of them. He will be happy that he has subjected to their criticism his humble endeavours, and that he has been able to draw from them any material assistance to the work. It may seem in any measure to illustrate the Gospel, and to contribute to the evidence of their authenticity. He has only to add his sincere thanks to one of his friends, who has been so kind as to undertake the whole matter of the publication.

5 DE60

C O N T E N T S.

DISCOURSE THE FIRST.

A SERMON, IN TWO PARTS.

On JOHN XX. 30, 31.

See the Heads, ————— Page 3

PART THE SECOND. ————— 3

DISCOURSE THE SECOND.

A COLLECTION OF HISTORICAL PROOFS.

S E C T. I.

General Introduction to the following Discourses. — 23

S E C T. II.

Testimonies of the Ancients concerning the Four Gospels. 24

*Ancient writers mentioned in this Discourse, and the times in
which they flourished.* ————— 33

DISCOURSE THE THIRD.

Preparations for determining the Order of the Evangelists by internal Evidence.

S E C T. I.

The question proposed, Whether the following Evangelists had seen the foregoing Gospels. — — 34

S E C T. II.

Parallel Passages of ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK. 35

S E C T. III.

Parallel Passages of ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE. 47

S E C T. IV.

Parallel Passages of ST. MARK and ST. LUKE. — 53

S E C T. V.

Conclusion drawn from the preceding comparisons, and confirmed by some other considerations. — — 59

S E C T. VI.

Principles of determining the order of the Evangelists on the ground of the preceding conclusion. — — 74

D I S-

DISCOURSE THE FOURTH.

ON ST. MATTHEW.

S E C T. I.

ST. MATTHEW *wrote before* ST. MARK. — 79

S E C T. II.

He wrote before ST. LUKE. — 87

S E C T. III.

He wrote very early. — 101

S E C T. IV.

Some objections considered and answered. — 109

S E C T. V.

He wrote for the Jews, and in Judea. — 114

DISCOURSE THE FIFTH.

ON ST. MARK.

S E C T. I.

ST. MARK *wrote before* ST. LUKE. — 129

S E C T. II.

He wrote his Gospel under the direction of ST. PETER. 142

S E C T. III.

<i>He composed his Gospel for a mixt society of Jewish and Gentile converts.</i>	— — —	153
--	-------	-----

S E C T. IV.

<i>He published his Gospel at Rome or in Italy.</i>	—	160
---	---	-----

S E C T. V.

<i>When He published his Gospel.</i>	— —	166
--------------------------------------	-----	-----

DISCOURSE THE SIXTH.

O N S T. L U K E.

S E C T. I.

<i>ST. LUKE wrote for the Gentile converts.</i>	—	169
---	---	-----

S E C T. II.

<i>Where He published his Gospel.</i>	— —	183
---------------------------------------	-----	-----

S E C T. III.

<i>Review of the argument concerning the order of the Gospels.</i>		191
--	--	-----

S E C T. IV.

<i>Observations on ST. LUKE's Preface.</i>	—	193
--	---	-----

D I S-

C O N T E N T S.

v

DISCOURSE THE SEVENTH.

ON ST. JOHN.

S E C T. I.

The design of ST. JOHN's Gospel. — — 203

S E C T. II.

When He published his Gospel, and where. — 206

S E C T. III.

Each succeeding Evangelist confirms the authenticity of the preceding Gospels. The credit and testimony of ST. MARK and ST. LUKE not weakened, because they had seen ST. MATTHEW's Gospel. — — 212

DISCOURSE THE EIGHTH.

IN TWO PARTS.

PART THE FIRST.

ON THE METHOD IN WHICH ST. JOHN RECKONS HIS HOURS.

S E C T. I.

Three instances of ST. JOHN's hours considered. — 215

SECT.

S E C T. II.

The fourth instance considered. — — 220

S E C T. III.

ST. JOHN divides the day according to the Roman manner;
but his hours are Asiatic. — — — 234

PART THE SECOND.

THE HOURS OF THE ROMANS AND OF SOME OTHER
ANCIENT NATIONS CONSIDERED. — 241

5 DE60

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS.

PAGE 5. line 30. *read* shows.—P. 8. l. 9. *read* Temptation.—P. 11. not. l. 4. *dele* the last comma.—P. 17. not. l. 2. *read* γὰρ.—*Ibid.* l. 3. *read* anima.—P. 20. l. 16. *read* Jews.—P. 21. l. 12. *dele* the comma.—P. 23. l. 4. *read* Gospels.—P. 27. l. 9. *dele* the second comma; and l. ult. *place* inverted commas.—P. 29. l. 13. *read* EUTYCHUS.—P. 30. l. 25. *place* a comma after ἱμελῆς, and add this note:

Instead of Λύκος Ἀχαιῶν, Fabricius, Bibl. Græc. L. iv. p. 132. reads, Λύκος Ἀχαιῶν, and with others of the learned supposes Lucius mentioned Rom. xvi. 21. to be St. Luke. See Wolfius on the place.

Pag. 42. col. 1. l. 15. *read* like wife.—P. 59. col. 1. l. 6. from the bottom, "clothing" should have been in Roman letters.—P. 62. l. 22. *read* were.—P. 64. l. 1. at the end *place* a colon.—P. 65. l. antepen. *read* depositaries.—P. 68. l. ult. *read* Evangelists.—P. 73. l. 19. *read* Spirit.—P. 79. l. 1. *dele* the comma after Matthew.—P. 82. l. 13. *read* Canaanitish.—P. 82. l. 14. *dele* the second comma.—P. 84. not. l. 4. *read* Jordan.—P. 85. l. 7. *dele* the comma.—P. 88. l. 10. *read* acquainted.—P. 103. not. l. ult. *read* Gerundenfis.—P. 115. l. 1. *dele* the second "and."—P. 118. l. 4. *place* a colon.—P. 123. not. l. 4. *read* Asian.—P. 131. not. l. 1. *read* διελθῶ.—P. 136. l. 9. *read* succeeding.—P. 148. not. l. 3. *read* Matth. xvi.—P. 154. l. 10. *read* GOD?—P. 164. not. l. 2. *read* Κεῖν.—*Ibid.* after xv. 16. &c. l. 5. add,

Παρασκευή ἢ ἡ ἐστὶν προπαρασκευή] Parasceve, or The preparation was a common name for Friday among the Jews. Yet St. Mark explains it; and so does St. Luke in his usual manner: *And that day was the preparation, AND THE SABBATH DREW ON.* xxiii. 54. St. Matthew calls it simply *The preparation.* xxvii. 62. And his words, *The next day that followed the preparation,* note the day of the week on which Christ was crucified, which he had not mentioned before, with greater propriety, than if, omitting the name of this day, he had told us, that the next day was the Sabbath.

Pag. 177. l. 17. *read* faith and gratitude.—*Ibid.* *read* [1] and when; and add in the notes the place [1] ix. 52—56.—P. 179. l. 3. *read* providently.—P. 180. l. 25. *read* † This.—P. 221. l. 1. *read* of our.

DISCOURSE THE FIRST.

A SERMON, IN TWO PARTS.

JOHN XX. 30, 31.

AND MANY OTHER SIGNS TRULY DID JESUS IN THE PRESENCE OF HIS DISCIPLES, WHICH ARE NOT WRITTEN IN THIS BOOK.

BUT THESE ARE WRITTEN, THAT YE MIGHT BELIEVE THAT JESUS IS THE CHRIST THE SON OF GOD, AND THAT BELIEVING YE MIGHT HAVE LIFE THROUGH HIS NAME.

ST. JOHN here declares what he chiefly purposed by writing a Gospel; and at the same time obviates some objections, which the nature of this Gospel might occasion to be raised against the other Evangelists or himself.

For a person who had read and compared their writings might have observed to him—You tell us things about which the other Evangelists are silent, and till towards the conclusion scarce take notice of any thing which they have related. If then you have given a full and true account of your LORD's actions, what are we to judge of *their* narrations?

That their veracity might not be questioned for this difference, ST. JOHN acquaints us, that he had related only some parts of the public life of CHRIST: *And many other signs truly did JESUS in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book.*

But on this avowal, which guards the credit of the other Gospels, might be founded an exception against his own. For it might be asked again; If CHRIST manifested his glory by such a number and variety of works, why have you recorded so few of them?

A

But

But we find this question also sufficiently answered. For first, his chief and ultimate view in writing a Gospel carries with it a plain reason of many omissions. *These things*, he says, *are written that ye might believe*. The readers, to whom he makes this apostrophe, were a society of Christians. What then would he teach them to believe? Not surely, that JESUS was the CHRIST foretold and promised to the fathers: for of this he could not suppose *them* ignorant or doubtful, who had read and received the other Gospels. But if some were fallen, or in danger of falling into * Jewish errors, and indisposed to think of the nature of CHRIST, as the truth and their happiness demanded, that they might have life through his name; it was a task worthy of an Apostle, to add some further illustrations of this high point.

The principal design of ST. JOHN'S Gospel will meet us again in another place: what I would now observe upon it is, that it did not require a distinct memorial of all the works of CHRIST, but chiefly an historical deduction of such passages, as proved the transcendent dignity of his nature.

Secondly, the words, *In the presence of his disciples*, point out another limitation of ST. JOHN'S plan: that he proposed to relate only those things which were public and well known to the disciples of CHRIST, and which he, this Evangelist, could attest as seen or heard by himself. And what the adherence to such a plan takes from the fulness of the history, it adds to the weight of it's authority.

A third reason of his silence concerning many transactions was, that it was unnecessary to repeat them. *They are not written in this book*, because they are already written by the other Evangelists in books of equal credit and fidelity: a reason intimated in the text, and implied in the whole tenor of his Gospel.

Lastly, it is evident, that he and the other Evangelists, writing for persons of all degrees, studied to make their Gospels

* See Bp Bull, *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*. C. 1. §. 13. p. 291.

not only as plain but as short as the subject could admit ; that they might not perplex the understanding, nor overburthen the memory of the simple and laborious. And to this end it was necessary to select what was most to the purpose of each, out of that variety and abundance that were before them : the life of the blessed JESUS being so rich in heavenly wonders, that a full and exact account of them had been an immense, or rather an impossible work ; as ST. JOHN assures us by a strong hyperbole in the concluding verse of his Gospel.

The text being thus opened, and our thoughts directed by it towards the other Gospels as well as ST. JOHN's ; I shall now proceed to make some observations on them all in the following method ;

First, I shall give some account of the peculiar design of each Gospel, and show to what state of the church it was adapted.

Secondly, I shall briefly view the characters of the Evangelists, and their qualifications for writing their several Gospels.

Thirdly, I shall suggest a few reflections arising from the subject before us.

But here it may be proper to take notice, that these observations proceed on a supposition of the following facts ;

That the Gospels were composed in the order in which they stand ; at least that ST. MATTHEW's was the first, and ST. JOHN's the last ;

That ST. MATTHEW wrote early in Jerusalem or Judea, ST. MARK and ST. LUKE in other countries ;

That ST. MATTHEW wrote more immediately for the Jews who had embraced the faith, ST. MARK for both Jewish and Gentile converts, ST. LUKE particularly for the latter ;

And that the Gospel of ST. MARK was written under the inspection of ST. PETER, of whom he was the follower, as ST. LUKE was of ST. PAUL.

These things must here in great measure be supposed, not because proof of them is wanting, but because it cannot be admitted into the present discourse.

THE FIRST then of the four Gospels was ST. MATTHEW'S, compiled within a few years of our LORD'S ascension, while the church consisted wholly of the circumcision, and principally of Jewish believers; to whose use it was admirably suited.

* For the Jews were much disposed to consider the letter of the Law as the compleat rule and measure of moral duty; to place religion in the observance of rites and ceremonies, or in a strict adherence to some favourite precepts, written or traditional; to ascribe to themselves sufficient power of doing the divine will without the divine assistance; and vain of a civil or legal righteousness to condemn all others, and esteem themselves so just that they needed no repentance, nor any expiation but what the law provided. They rested in the covenant of circumcision and their descent from Abraham as a sure title to salvation, however their lives were led: and though they looked for a MESSIAH, yet with so little idea of an atonement for sin to be made by his death, that the cross proved the great stumbling-block to them. They expected him to appear with outward splendor, as the dispenser of temporal felicity; the chief blessings of which were to redound to their own nation in an earthly Canaan, and in conquest and dominion over the rest of mankind.

A tincture of these delusive notions, which they had imbibed by education and the doctrine of their elders, would be apt to remain with too many, even after their admission into the church of CHRIST. How necessary then was it, that just principles concerning the way of life and happiness, and the nature and extent of the Gospel should be infused into the breasts of these sons of Sion, that they might be able to work out their own salvation, and promote that of others: since they were to be the *salt of the earth*, and *the light of the world*; the first preachers of righteousness to the nations, and the instruments of calling mankind to the knowledge of the truth.

* See Justin Martyr's Dial. with Trypho the Jew. p. 153. 156. 164, &c. Ed. Thirlby. Bull's Harmonia Apostolica. Pars Posterior. Ch. xv, xvi, xvii. Whitby on Matth. iii. 9. Rom. ii. 13. 2 Thess. C. ii. p. 438.

ST. MATTHEW therefore has chosen out of the materials before him such parts of our blessed SAVIOUR's history and discourses as were best suited to the purpose of awakening them to a sense of their sins, of abating their self-conceit and overweening hopes, of rectifying their errors, correcting their prejudices, and exalting and purifying their minds. After a short account, more particularly requisite in the first writer of a Gospel, of the genealogy and miraculous birth of CHRIST, and a few circumstances relating to his infancy, he proceeds to describe his forerunner JOHN THE BAPTIST, who preached the necessity of repentance to the race of ABRAHAM and children of the circumcision; and by his testimony prepares us to expect one mightier than he; mightier as a prophet in deed and word, and above the sphere of a prophet, mighty to sanctify by his Spirit, to pardon, reward and punish by his sovereignty. Then the spiritual nature of his kingdom, the pure and perfect laws by which it is administered, and the necessity of vital and universal obedience to them are set before us in various discourses, beginning with the sermon on the mount, to which ST. MATTHEW hastens, as with a rapid pace, to lead his readers. And that the holy light shining on the mind by the word and life of CHRIST, and quickening the heart by his Spirit, might be seconded in it's operations by the powers of hope and fear, the twenty-fifth chapter of this Gospel, which finishes the legislation of CHRIST, exhibits him enforcing his precepts and adding a sanction to his laws by that noble and awful description of his future appearance in glory, and the gathering of all nations before him to judgment.

ST. MATTHEW then passing to the history of the Passion, shews them, that the NEW COVENANT foretold by their prophets was a covenant of spiritual not temporal blessings, established in the sufferings and death of CHRIST, ** whose blood was shed for many* FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS; which it was

* Matth. xxvi. 28.

not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away: To purge the conscience from the pollution of dead and sinful works required the blood of Him, *who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God.*

With the instructions of CHRIST are intermixed many hints, that the kingdom of GOD would not be confined to the Jews, but while numbers of them were excluded through unbelief, would be increased by subjects of other nations. And thus the devout Israelite was taught, in submission to the will and ordinance of Heaven, to embrace the believing Samaritan as a brother, and to welcome the admission of the Gentiles into the church, which was soon after to commence with the calling of CORNELIUS.

And as they suffered persecution from their own nation, and were to expect it elsewhere in following CHRIST, all that can fortify the mind with neglect of earthly good, and contempt of worldly danger, when they come in competition with our duty, is strongly inculcated.

The second Gospel was ST. MARK's, admirably suited to it's order and time: for ST. MATTHEW's, we presume, was already known and read throughout the Christian church. And as it contained so large and excellent a recital of our LORD's instructions by precept and parable, ST. MARK thought it less needful to be copious on this head, and hath more particularly applied himself to give an accurate and distinct account of facts; some few of which are first mentioned by *him*: but in general he follows the occurrences, though not always the order, of ST. MATTHEW's history. He tells the same miracles and actions, and nearly in the same language, * yet often with additions of considerable circumstances. So that his Gospel hath the spirit of an original, of a work composed by one who did not learn from ST. MATTHEW what he has adopted from him, but wrote

* There is scarce any one story related by both these Evangelists, in which St. Mark does not add some considerable circumstances which St. Matthew has not. *Jones's Vindication of St. Matthew's Gospel.* p. 56. where this matter is exemplified.

with

with an antecedent knowledge of his subject, and described things as an eye-witness would describe them.

It was published, according to the general suffrage of the ancients, in Italy or at Rome. And indeed it bears evident tokens of being calculated for a church that consisted, as did the Roman, of Pagan intermixed with Jewish converts. It concurs with ST. MATTHEW's in delivering the censures which our LORD passed on the corrupt traditions and maxims of the Scribes and Pharisees, and in relating matters which more immediately concerned the Jews. But then ST. MARK plainly supposes a part of his readers to be not much conversant in their usages and affairs, and inserts either direct or oblique explications in places where ST. MATTHEW goes on with the subject as needing no exposition. And when in other respects they perfectly correspond, we may observe some one particular expressed a little differently by ST. MARK, for the sake of rendering the sense more easy, or more edifying, to those who had been aliens from the commonwealth of Israel.

We may therefore consider him as suiting ST. MATTHEW's text to a change in the church by the addition of foreign members, and as often enlarging on his facts for the benefit of distant and less informed believers. In doing which he so fully harmonizes with ST. MATTHEW, as to confirm his evidence by a fresh testimony.

But this agreeing testimony is also of apostolical authority: for there is a very general consent of ancient writers, that ST. MARK composed his Gospel under the inspection of ST. PETER; and their authorities are confirmed by many internal characters. The great humility of this Apostle is conspicuous in every part of it, where any thing is related or might be related of him; his weaknesses and fall being exposed to view; while the things that redound to his honour are either slightly touched or wholly concealed. And with regard to CHRIST, scarce any action that was done or word that was spoken by him is mentioned, at which this Apostle was not present.

It

It hath an introduction of only fifteen verses, before it brings us to the calling of ST. PETER. And these verses comprise all that ST. MARK relates of the public preaching of JOHN, the Baptism of CHRIST, and the Temptation in the wilderness. ST. PETER had been a hearer of the Baptist, and might probably be a spectator of the baptizing of CHRIST. But because he was not a witness of the Temptation in the wilderness, it is very concisely told in general terms, and without notice taken of the incidents which attended it. In the description of the Transfiguration, * which seems animated by the impressions that this glorious scene had made on ST. PETER, we have the voice from heaven which he certainly heard, and the appearance of MOSES and ELIAS, whom he as surely saw. But the subject of their conference with CHRIST, † which we learn from ST. LUKE, is not mentioned. ST. PETER, perhaps overpowered by the heavenly glory, was asleep during part of the conversation.

‡ ST. CHRYSOSTOM, no incompetent judge of the language of the Apostles, discovers in this Gospel the concise stile of ST. PETER, as in ST. LUKE's the more diffuse diction of ST. PAUL. And certainly there are passages in it, where ST. PETER appears to have directed not only the matter and circumstances but the very words of the narration.

|| In the miracle of feeding the five thousand with five barley loaves and two small fishes, THE GREEN GRASS on which the multitude sat down seems a slight circumstance to enter into the description of so wonderful a work; yet was naturally enough mentioned by one, who had seen that multitude sit down, and

* St. Mark mentions a striking circumstance ix. 15. of which St. Matthew and St. Luke take no notice; that on the descent of our Lord from the mount on which he had been transfigured, *All the people when they beheld him were greatly amazed*; that is, as Dr. Doddridge after Whitby seems well to explain it, "At those unusual rays of majestic and glory which yet remained on his countenance." Compare Exod. xxxiv. 29, 30.

† Luke ix. 31.

‡ Hom. in Matth. V. ii. p. 20. lin. 1. Ed. Savil.

|| See Mark vi. 39. Matth. xiv. 19. Joh. vi. 10. Compare Luke ix. 15.

assisted in ministering to them. This then being the account of a spectator, is that of ST. PETER. And hence it appears, why also ST. MATTHEW and ST. JOHN speak of THE GRASS, and of the MUCH GRASS that was in the place, and why ST. LUKE takes no notice of it.

If ST. MARK was not a Galilean, and he seems rather to have been a native of Jerusalem, he probably learnt of ST. PETER to call HEROD ANTIPAS, who beheaded JOHN the Baptist, * *king* HEROD. His subjects spoke of their sovereign in this stile of honour; and therefore ST. MATTHEW, who, as well as ST. PETER, had stood in this relation to him, † once uses it. But others, I presume, ‡ Jews as well as Greeks, gave him the title only of *Tetrarch*, as ST. LUKE has done.

The same account may be given, why ST. MARK calls the lake where ST. PETER had employed so many of his younger years, § THE SEA OF GALILEE; as ST. MATTHEW and ST. JOHN likewise term it; speaking the language of the country in which they had been bred. It was natural to an inland people, most of whom never saw the ocean, to call this great body of waters A SEA. But ST. LUKE, who seems to have been born or educated in a different situation, never calls it a SEA, but always a LAKE: || and probably ST. MARK would

* Mark vi. 14.—27. Tetrarcham regem vocat, quia sic a suis vocabatur. Grot. in loc.

† Matth. xiv. 9.

‡ So, I believe, Josephus always calls him.

§ Mark i. 16. &c.

|| It was anciently called the *Sea of Chinnereth*. Numb. xxxiv. 11. But when the author of the first book of Maccabees lived, *The water of Gennefar*. 1 Macc. xi. 67. Josephus calls it *the Waters of Gennefar*. Antiq. xiii. 5. §. 7. *the Lake of Gennefartth*. ib. v. 1. §. 22. xviii. 2. §. 1. 3. and *the lake of Gennefar*. War. ii. 20. §. 6 iii. 10. §. 1. 7. So that in St. Mark's time, the name of a *sea* seems to have been retained chiefly in provincial language.

In the following sentence the change of SEA into LAKE is the more remarkable, as St. Luke in the other words agrees exactly with St. Matthew and St. Mark.

Matth. viii. 32. Mark. v. 13.

The herd ran violently down a steep place
into the SEA.

Luke viii. 33.

The herd ran violently down a steep place
into the LAKE.

have done so too, if he had been left to use the language of Jerusalem improved by more general converse and knowledge.

From these and other considerations, too many to be now offered, it seems evident, that this Gospel was dictated by ST. PETER, and as far as the connection of the history admitted, was limited with scrupulous exactness to those occurrences in the life of CHRIST, which he could attest as seen or heard by himself.

It hath been observed, that ST. MARK's Gospel was compiled for a mixt society of the faithful; but ST. LUKE's, which we are next to consider, was designed immediately for the converted Gentiles, who were become a considerable part of the mystical body of CHRIST. For the sacred inclosure of the church being opened, a large multitude of sincere believers was received within its pale, gathered by the blessing of GOD on his own appointment, not only from among the devout Gentiles or worshippers of one GOD, such as was * CORNELIUS the Centurion, but also from among the idolatrous part of them: one of whom, and the first upon record, was † SERGIUS PAULUS the governor of Cyprus.

These persons were *called out of darkness into a marvellous light*. But a light, which showed them a law of perfect righteousness and GOD the judge of all men, must have filled their awakened minds with terror and anguish, unless they had seen, that as ‡ *Justice and Judgement are the habitation of his throne, mercy and truth go before his face*. ST. LUKE therefore has been careful to present them with this view of things, and to exhibit to them such passages of the life and doctrine of CHRIST, as are examples of divine goodness towards those who were not of the race of ABRAHAM, or yield the liveliest assurances of acceptance to sincere penitents. For though our blessed LORD was personally sent only to the lost sheep of the

* Acts x. 1.

† Ib. xiii. 7.—12.

‡ Psal. LXXXIX. 14.

house of ISRAEL, yet with heavenly foresight and providence he had said and done many things, which, when he commissioned his Apostles to call the Gentiles to repentance, would afford them the strongest encouragement to obey the call. Several things of this character are peculiar to ST. LUKE's Gospel; and among them we may reckon the story of the prodigal son; which sets forth the case of the Jew and Gentile in a beautiful parable of a * prophetic nature; and intimates, that the Gentile, represented by the younger the prodigal son, returning at length to his heavenly Father, would meet with the most merciful and gracious and affectionate reception.

† ST. MATTHEW, in deducing the genealogy of CHRIST, had contented himself with showing, that JESUS was the son of ABRAHAM and DAVID, from whom the Scriptures taught the Jews to expect the MESSIAH to spring. But ST. LUKE traces his lineage up to ADAM; and thus signifies, among other important truths, that he is *the Seed of the Woman* promised to our first parents, as the common Saviour of them and all their posterity, without distinction of Greek or Jew, bond or free; and that, *as in ADAM all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive.*

ST. LUKE is equally solicitous to instruct the Gentiles in the duties and doctrines of the Gospel, as to encourage them to embrace it; to expound what was new to them; clear what was doubtful; and render the whole of his history plain and comprehensible. It would lead me too far to illustrate these matters by apposite examples. I shall therefore mention only

* So Jerom, Augustin, Gregory the Great, and others of the ancients, understood this parable, according to Cornelius a Lapide on Luke xv. 11. See also Grotius on Matthew xxii. 9.

† Ο μὲν Ματθαῖος, ἀπὲρ Εὐαγγελίου γράφων, ἔδωκεν πλείον ἐξήγησι δάξαι, ἢ ὅτι ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Δαβὶδ ἦν. Ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς, ἀπὲρ κρινῇ πᾶσι διηγουμένῳ, ἀνωτέρω τὸν λόγον ἀνάγει, μέχρι τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὡς ἀρχῆς. Chrysostom. V. ii. p. 3. lin. 36. Ed. Savil. See also Irenæus. B. iii. C. xxxiii. at the beginning.

one instance, which, though of less consequence, is a proof of his care to inform them. As they were little acquainted with the transactions of Judea, he has marked the æras, when CHRIST was born, and when JOHN began to announce the Gospel, by the reigns of the Roman emperors: to which point ST. MATTHEW and the other Evangelists have not attended.

DISCOURSE THE FIRST.

PART THE SECOND.

LET us now turn our eyes towards ST. JOHN, who having perused and approved the three former Gospels, and being, as many suppose, the only survivor of the Apostles, judged it expedient to add, in historical order, several important notices concerning CHRIST, which had been hitherto omitted.

Accordingly the greater part of his Gospel is composed of occurrences either preceding the time at which the other Evangelists begin our LORD's public ministry, or which happened at Jerusalem or in the neighbourhood of that city. For they almost wholly confined themselves to relate what was done in or near Galilee, or beyond Jordan; and chose rather to be silent than say little about our LORD's miracles and discourses at Jerusalem. This part the HOLY SPIRIT *dividing severally as he saw good*, * reserved as a peculiar province for ST. JOHN, till we come to the last days of our SAVIOUR's life; and then all the four Evangelists as it were meet together in the same place near Jerusalem. But even from hence ST. JOHN proceeds as much as possible in an unbeaten track, and still observes the same method of reciting only so much in common with the other Evangelists as may serve to connect his Gospel with theirs. By not repeating what had been related by them, he gives his testimony, that it is faithfully and justly related; and at the same time leaves himself room to enlarge the gospel-history.

* Ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἰερουσαλὴμ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μέζοναι καὶ πλείονες λόγους. Origen. Comment. in Joannem.

In this view his Gospel is a supplement to the other three. But this was only a secondary end of writing it. * For heresy sprang up and was branching into heads; and Faith called the authority of the beloved disciple to her aid. He interposed for her security and † assurance, and explained, Who and What he is that was made flesh and dwelt among us: ‡ which he taught more directly in his own words, and more copiously in the words of CHRIST, than the other Evangelists: who (though they fail not in many places to give plain evidences of his divinity) have chiefly recorded his practical addresses to the people; but ST. JOHN sets before us § his conferences with the eminent and learned Jews; and those other discourses, in which he had occasion to speak of the dignity of his nature and union with the Father. And that we might be duly prepared to conceive the force and import of his words, and to understand them in their sublimest sense, ST. JOHN opens his Gospel with instructing us, that “*The WORD which was made Flesh was in the beginning with GOD and was GOD;*” and, that “*all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.*” And having displayed the divinity of this WORD incarnate in a variety of lights, he calls upon his Christian readers in concluding, to review what he had laid before them as sufficient evidences, that CHRIST is the Son of GOD, the only begotten of the FATHER, in that high sense which he set out with asserting. “*These things are written, that ye might*

* See Irenæus Adversus Hæres. B. iii. C. xi. p. 218. Ed. Oxon.

† Omni fiducia plenum est evangelium istud. ib. p. 222.

‡ See the testimonies, particularly that of Origen, before St. John's Gospel in Mill's Greek Testament. See also Dr. Knight's Sermons at Lady Moyer's Lecture, p. 205.

§ Lightfoot in his Harmony, part iii. Eachard in his Eccl. Hist. V. i. c. iv. Dr. Doddridge in his Fam. Expositor, V. i. p. 290. &c. are of opinion, that our Lord's Discourse, John v. 17.—47. was delivered before the great Sanhedrim: and it is highly probable, that the persons there concerned were at least members of it; for the 33d ver'se, *Ye sent unto John and he bare witness unto the truth*, refers to the deputation which they had sent unto John and his answer to them; (Joh. i. 19.—24) and v. 44. was spoken to those who valued themselves on the honours and dignities which they bore. See Doddridge.

“*believe*

"*believe that JESUS is the CHRIST the Son of GOD, and that believing ye might have life through his name.*"

The Spirit of Inspiration having confirmed the certainty of this high article, and guarded the church against errors of faith by the Gospel of ST. JOHN, sealed the volume of the book; if not the volume of the whole New Testament, at least that which described the Son of GOD's abode on earth.

I proceed, *secondly*, to view briefly the characters of the Evangelists, and their qualifications for writing their several Gospels.

ST. MATTHEW had his education and employment among the publicans, or farmers of the public taxes; men of so odious a character and so famous for injustice and oppression, that in Judea publicans and sinners were names usually joined together; as if he who was a publican by profession was sure to be a sinner by life. Yet many of them attended to the instructions of JOHN the Baptist, and of CHRIST, and became sincere penitents. * ZACCHEUS in particular made fourfold restitution for every act of extortion, and then gave the half of his income to the poor. So that our LORD himself, who vouchsafed to visit him, declared him *a Son of ABRAHAM, and that Salvation was come to his house*. ST. MATTHEW takes no notice of ZACCHEUS, whose conduct might have helped to retrieve the credit of his profession, † but faithfully records the passages in which they are ranked with sinners and heathens. In naming himself, which it was twice necessary to do, he has shown as much humility as could have place on either occasion. ‡ He mentions indeed, that when he was called by CHRIST *he arose and followed him*, but not, as ST. LUKE relates, *that he left all to follow him*; nor that *he made a great feast at his own house*, which our LORD honoured with his presence. When he enumerates the twelve Apostles, whose pre-eminence

* Luke xix. 2.—10.

† Matth. ix. 11. xi. 19. xviii. 17. xxi. 31, 32.

‡ Matth. ix. 9. compare Luke v. 27.—29.

to the other disciples he studiously suppresses, * he places himself after ST. THOMAS, before whom he is ranked by ST. MARK and ST. LUKE. † They do not join his former profession with the apostolical name of MATTHEW, but rather veil it under the less known name of LEVI; but he reminds us, that he was MATTHEW THE PUBLICAN.

If he is ‡ the least distinct of the Evangelists in his history, he designed by the brevity of the narrative part to render the doctrinal more compleat; silent as much as possible himself, that CHRIST may discourse more at large in his Gospel. For being invited to be a disciple, he became an attentive hearer of our LORD, and let the word sink deep into his heart. We may charitably believe, that while he sat at the receipt of custom he observed the Baptist's precept, of *exacting no more than that which was appointed him*. But if the publicans among whom he lived, acted upon the general maxims of their society, and behaved like the rest, the difference which he beheld in Him who called him must render the doctrine and life of CHRIST more striking and venerable and dear to him: by the sacred energy of which, as the whole tenor of his Gospel demonstrates, he conceived as just a sense, and as ardent a love of every grace and virtue that appertained to his high calling, as could animate the breast of man. We may therefore esteem him an instrument in the hands of Providence peculiarly fit to record his divine Master's lessons and instructions, which are the rule of our practice.

But ST. JOHN entered into the family of CHRIST while his youth was unspotted from the world; and being led on to still higher degrees of purity and holiness under the blessed influence of his LORD, who loved and honoured him with his intimacy,

* Matth. x. 3. compare Mark iii. 18. Luke vi. 15.

† "Αξιον δε και ε δασαυε θαυμασαι την σαρραν, πως εκ αποκρισεται αυτη τ' εμπροθεν βιον, και η το ονομα τιθισι, τ' αλλων κρυψαντων αυτο σεσημασμεν ιτιγα. Chrysost. V. ii. p. 204. ad sum. pag. Ed. Savil. See also a fine passage on this and the foregoing point, in EUSEB. *Demonstrat.* L. iii. C. v. p. 109. quoted by Dr. LARDNER, *Credibility*. V. viii. p. 83. Compare Matth. ix. 9. Mark ii. 14. Luke v. 27.

‡ Grot. on Matth. viii. 5.

he

he was of a mind aptly qualified to apprehend the higher mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. For if the pure in heart have a promise, as of a congenial reward, * that they shall hereafter see God; we may believe, that in such measure as their hearts are pure, they will have a capacity for some anticipation of this blessed Vision here on earth. ST. JOHN therefore, as a person of this character, was especially qualified to conceive and teach those mysterious truths which are the object of our Faith.

ST. MARK was trained up under the discipline, if not of our LORD himself, yet of his prime Apostles, and, according to the consent of antiquity, of ST. PETER in particular; a witness of the simplicity of his mind, the sanctity of his life, the meekness of his instructions, and of that zealous love of CHRIST, † for the sincerity of which this Apostle dared appeal to Him who knoweth all things. With these advantages ST. MARK so profited in the School of CHRIST, and so approved himself to his venerable director, as to merit from him the endearing title of ‡ his Son; and at length, § as the histories of the church relate, to be promoted to the highest rank of the pastoral office. Thus being a scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, he was able, we presume, to have compiled his Gospel || from a store of general knowledge, and upon his own plan; but that he chose to confine himself to the testimony of ST. PETER, and in great measure to ST. MATTHEW's history; *that in the mouth of two witnesses every word might be established*; sacrificing every thought and counsel of his own to the glory of GOD, and the edification of his church.

* Matt. v. 8. ὁ ἰδὼν τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ ἁγίου, τότε δίδεται τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σκηνήν, οὕτως καὶ ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ δίδεται ὅψιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν τῶν χειρῶν γινώσκων. Sicut speculum, si fuerit mundum, recipit imagines, ita etiam anima pura accipit visionem Dei et Scripturarum notitiam. Theophylact in cap. v. Matthæi.

† John xxi. 17.

‡ 1 Pet. v. 13.

§ He is said to have been the first bishop of Alexandria in Egypt. Cave's Hist. Literar. V. i. p. 24. Jerom in Lardner's Suppl. V. i. p. 176.

|| Lardner ib. p. 467.

ST. LUKE, it is well known, was a follower of ST. PAUL, whom he attended with great constancy and friendship. And as strong affection works a likeness of manners, he would be led by this great Apostle's conversation, under the power of heavenly grace, to that love of truth and holiness, that spirit of resignation, fortitude, and neglect of earthly things, essential to one who was to understand the mind of CHRIST, and to write as He had taught and lived; and to that largeness of thought and comprehensive charity, which would be strongly impressed with such passages of his life and doctrine, as most suited a Gospel for the use of the Gentiles.

Nor was he less furnished with the knowledge than the temper of an Evangelist. Instructed by those *who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word*; by him who was taught the Gospel *by the revelation of JESUS CHRIST*, he had a perfect understanding of all things from the very first. And with this extent of intelligence, having different views from ST. MARK, he modelled his Gospel after a different manner; and prefaced the account of our LORD's public ministry with several interesting particulars relating to the birth of JOHN the Baptist, the annunciation of the blessed Virgin, the nativity of CHRIST, and his presentation in the Temple; which, though they made no part of the testimony of a faithful witness, came within the province of a well-informed historian.

And thus GOD was graciously pleased to provide chosen instruments for recording the life and doctrine of his blessed Son; * that what he requires us to do and believe in order to salvation, might be delivered to us by a fit number of the best qualified persons.

I shall now, *lastly*, suggest a few reflections arising from the subject before us.

* "Ἰνα ἀπὸ περισσίων εὐαγγελίσαν τὴν πᾶσιν κατὰ τὴν σάρκα καὶ κατὰ τὴν Θεότητα ἀκριβοῦς κατὰ-
χαμιν. Epiphan. Hær. LI. n. xix.

We

We ascribe, and I trust with equal piety and justice, the gift of inspiration to all the Evangelists. But this must be supported against cavils and objections by a reasonable account of their consent with each other. Now if we attend properly to the nature and design of each Gospel, and the character and situation of its author, they will commonly point out the reason, why he is general or more distinct in his narration, brief in one article and copious in another, why he expresses himself in such or such a manner, or dwells on this or that particular, and passes by others, which of themselves may appear of equal or greater importance. Not only the propriety and spirit of many passages, will be more conspicuous in this light, than if they are viewed in disjointed pieces or in a blended text; but little variations of one Gospel from another will be seen to result from the genius of the work, in an equal consistence with truth; and seeming repugnances between the sacred historians will find an easy solution.

AGAIN, the genuineness and integrity of the Gospels are matters of the greatest importance to our Christian faith: and though, GOD be praised, we have abundant proof of both from the consentient testimony, * the numerous citations, the comments of antiquity, † and the well-known care of the primitive and succeeding ages of the church to preserve these sacred deposits inviolate; yet a religious mind must observe with comfort and delight, to how great a degree the Gospels authenticate themselves.

If we take a few plain historical facts from ancient and credible authors, that four Gospels were composed by such men, on such occasions, and in such a manner, and then carefully examine

* See Mr. Jones's New and Full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament. part iv.

† Quis dicat hoc mereri non potuisse Apostolorum ecclesiam, tam fidam, tam numerosam fratrum concordiam, ut eorum scripta fideliter ad posteros trajicerent, cum eorum cathedras usque ad presentes episcopos certissima successione servaverint: cum hoc qualiumcunque hominum scriptis, sive extra ecclesiam, sive in ipsa ecclesia tanta facilitate proveniat? Augustin. contra Faustum. L. xxxiii. C. 6.

the distinct characters of the Gospels as we now have them, * we shall find them answer with great exactness to the idea given of their state in the ages of these authors.

But with a very few notices from other writers, an examination of the Gospels themselves will open to us a further view, and show clearly, that we possess them not only as the Fathers transmitted them, but as the Evangelists wrote them. For if we consider them attentively, we shall find in each such a plain and unstudied agreement with the circumstances of its author, and of persons and things then subsisting, as could only proceed from the Evangelist himself.

We find in ST. MATTHEW the marks of his relation to Galilee, where he had been bred and employed: the stile of one who had imbibed and retained the veneration of his people for their city and temple; who had a familiar acquaintance with the laws and maxims and manners of the Jews; and addressed himself to them in his Gospel. His language in treating of the most significant and exalted character which hath appeared among men is so simple and unadorned, as to be a clear indication, that the noble and majestic, which are sometimes intermixed with this simplicity, were the plain and faithful representation of what he had seen and heard.

There are in his Gospel and in ST. JOHN's very evident tokens, that they were composed by Apostles of CHRIST: nor is it less conspicuous, that ST. MARK's was dictated by a person of the same order.

Another character is distinguishable in ST. LUKE; the character of one who wrote with a comprehensive knowledge of his subject, but not as an Apostle, or eye-witness. Those little circumstances, which the description of a beholder is apt to associate with the chief action, may be observed in several places of ST. MARK, and sometimes in the latter part of

* Irenæus in particular, besides quoting innumerable texts from the four Gospels, tells us, B. iii. Ch. xi. how each begins: and Ch. xiv. gives a catalogue of passages peculiar to St. Luke.

the Acts of the Apostles, but we hardly meet with them in ST. LUKE's Gospel.

He treats the failings of the Apostles with much greater tenderness than they themselves do; and calls them by this name of preeminence, which they do not assume.

When he makes mention of CHRIST, as from himself, he substitutes the title of LORD for the name of JESUS oftener than all the other Evangelists together. ST. MATTHEW in his own person never uses it; ST. JOHN seldom; and ST. MARK only at the end of his Gospel, where he speaks of CHRIST's session at the right hand of GOD. Perhaps ST. LUKE had seldom or never seen Him, as *made a little lower than the angels*, whom he continually saw, in his signs and wonders, in his gifts and graces and spiritual blessings to his church, as crowned with glory and honour, and LORD of all: and what was ascendant in his thoughts had an influence on his diction.

Thus, while the great objects proposed to us in the Gospels help to assure our minds, that our religion is from GOD; an inferior train of circumstances is interwoven with the history of this religion, which, if we duly attend to them, will help to satisfy us, that the history is authentic. The use of certain words or phrases by one Evangelist, the change or omission of them by another, little diversities, enlargements, or contractions in relating the same thing, these and other incidental peculiarities, which are found in each of the Gospels, have a congruity with the characters or designs of the several Evangelists that is so just and natural, and often consists in something so minute and insignificant in itself, as to exclude all suspicion of after-device. Hence therefore we have a powerful confirmation of the external evidence, that each Gospel is the work of the author whose name it bears, and has all along subsisted just as he published it.

But a regard not only to the peculiarities but the concurrence of the Gospels may afford us matter of instruction. With one remark on which article I shall conclude this discourse.

From

From the infancy of CHRIST till the day of his showing unto Israel, only one incident, that he was found in the Temple among the doctors, is recorded of him. Now if ST. MARK confined his narration to the testimony of ST. PETER, and ST. JOHN to what was done in the presence of the Disciples and himself; ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE allowed themselves more latitude, particularly in the introductions to their Gospels; where a few chapters more would very little have affected their designed conciseness. Yet if we except this incident mentioned by ST. LUKE, they also are as silent as the other Evangelists concerning thirty years of a Life, which in the most private and humble parts of it was no doubt highly exemplary and instructive.

If we may presume to ask, why so strict a silence in this matter was imposed on the Evangelists by their Divine Inspirer; and then to assign reasons for it; one appears to have been; That the primary end, for which the Son of GOD took our nature upon him, was, that he might suffer and make atonement for sin. And therefore a veil and covering are thrown over so great a space of his life, and many bright instances of exalted love of GOD and man are wrapt in obscurity, that his meritorious death and passion may stand forth to view more eminent and illustrious. The history of which is circumstantially related by all the Evangelists; not to move our affections with the tragical disasters of a just person, but to call our attention to the great sacrifice of the Cross; and that with a due sense of our own demerit, and of his mighty love, we may look up to Him, "*Whom GOD hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood.*" Rom. iii. 25.

DISCOURSE THE SECOND.

A COLLECTION OF HISTORICAL PROOFS.

S E C T. I.

General Introduction to the following Discourses.

I SHALL endeavour in these discourses to verify the facts which I mentioned in the Sermon as then taken for granted. They are such as cannot fail of throwing some light on the Gospel; if clear proof of them can be made: and should it fall short of certainty, it seems to me, that the inquiry itself will not be uninteresting. It will lead us to examine and compare a variety of texts; and will bring in view many passages, which either show the variations of the Evangelists to be perfectly consistent with their inspiration, or afford strong evidence of the authenticity of their writings. And though these two subjects will not be professedly resumed, yet I hope that many illustrations of them will meet the reader's notice in the course of the work: which treats more immediately of the following articles;

- I. That ST. MATTHEW was the first writer of a Gospel; that he composed it early for the instruction of the Jewish people, and published it in *Judea*.
- II. That ST. MARK was the second Evangelist; whose Gospel was revised or even dictated by ST. PETER: that it was compiled for a mixt society of Jewish and Gentile converts,

verts, and according to all appearances published at *Rome* or in *Italy*.

III. That the next Evangelist ST. LUKE wrote with a more peculiar view to the converted Gentiles, and, as seems likely, in *Achaia*.

IV. That ST. JOHN had seen the three former Gospels, and bore testimony to the truth of them; and wrote his own probably after the destruction of *Jerusalem* in *Asia Minor*.

On these several heads I will first allege authorities from ancient Christian writers; and then endeavour to bring a consonant evidence from the Gospels themselves.

But as I purpose to consider chiefly the *internal* evidence, I shall give only a summary view of the *historical*; collections of which may easily be found in learned authors, as LE CLERC in his *Evangelical Harmony*, Dr. MILL in the testimonies prefixed to each Gospel, Mr. JONES in his book intitled, *A new and full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament*, and Dr. LARDNER in his valuable work, *The Credibility of the Gospel History*.

S E C T. II.

Testimonies of the Ancients concerning the Four Gospels.

I. §. ST. MATTHEW was the first writer of a Gospel.

THIS appears to have been a settled point among the ancient writers of the church; some of whose testimonies will follow in the next article but one.

2. §. He wrote it within a few years of the *Ascension* of CHRIST.

If IRENÆUS, in a passage which will * elsewhere be examined, did not mean to declare when ST. MATTHEW's Gospel

* Discourse IV. Sect. IV. §. 6.

was published, the earlier writers now extant have left no certain information concerning the date of it. But * COSMAS of *Alexandria* about the year DXXXV says, that it was written in the persecution which began with the stoning of STEPHEN. † ISIDORE of *Seville*, who lived towards the close of the same century, supposes it to have been written in the reign of CALIGULA, which ended, A. D. XLI. ‡ THEOPHYLACT in the eleventh century, and EUTHYMIUS in the beginning of the twelfth, fix upon a date, for which the authority of EUSEBIUS in his *Chronicon* is pleaded by some, § but rejected by others as spurious: they say, that ST. MATTHEW compiled his Gospel in the eighth year after our LORD's ascension. || The subscriptions at the end of the ancient manuscripts of this Gospel, and of the ancient translations of it, say the same thing. These are evidences of a prevailing opinion, that it was early written. But if they are less regarded as authorities partly of a lower antiquity, and partly anonymous, let us recur to COSMAS of *Alexandria*, who stands next to the higher ages, as an interpreter of their sentiments to us.

3. §. *He wrote for the instruction of the Jews, and in Jerusalem or Judea.*

His Gospel doubtless was designed for the benefit of the universal church, as well immediately by the history and doctrine of CHRIST, as mediately by a right institution of the Jewish believers, who were to be the first teachers of the Gentiles. But the Holy Spirit, under whose influence it was written, seems to have guided or left ST. MATTHEW to re-

* *Lardner's Supplement*. V. i. p. 100.

† *Lardner's Credibility*. V. xi. p. 375.

‡ *Suppl.* V. i. p. 101, 102. See also the testimonies prefixed to St. Matthew's Gospel in *Mill's Greek Testament*.

§ *Lardner's Credibility*. Part ii. V. viii. p. 176.

|| *Vindication of St. Matthew's Gospel* by Mr. Jones. p. 219. See also V. i. p. 194. of an *Historical Dissertation on the books of the New Testament* by Mr. Robert Cockburns, printed 1755, which seems a work of more merit than fame.

cite many particulars more directly relative and interesting to the Jews. This is meant by saying, that he wrote for their instruction. And this was the sense of antiquity.

IRENÆUS relates, B. iii. C. i. that "MATTHEW among the *Hebrews* published a written Gospel in their own language," and then speaks of the other three in the order in which we still find them.

* ORIGEN says, "that he was taught by tradition concerning the Four Gospels, which alone are acknowledged by the whole church of God, that the first was written by MATTHEW, formerly a publican and afterwards an Apostle of JESUS CHRIST, who composed it in Hebrew and published it for the Jews converted to the faith." † So ST. JEROM; "First of all MATTHEW the publican, surnamed LEVI, published a Gospel in *Judea* in the Hebrew language principally for the sake of the Jews believing in JESUS." ‡ And ST. AUGUSTIN; "They are said to have written in this order; first MATTHEW, next MARK, then LUKE, and last of all JOHN—of these four MATTHEW only is said to have written in Hebrew, the rest in Greek." More authorities are needless.

§ DUPIN, in *The History of the Canon of Scripture*, cites these and several other writers all affirming, that ST. MATTHEW wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. The truth of which point has been much questioned or rather denied by learned moderns, who contend that he wrote in Greek. But there seems more reason for allowing two originals than for contesting either; the consent of antiquity pleading strongly for the *Hebrew*, and evident marks of originality for the *Greek*. There are instances of authors who have themselves published the same work in two languages. || So JOSEPHUS wrote the History of the

* Testimonies prefixed by *Mill* to St. Matthew's Gospel.

† *Præf. Comment. in Matth.*

‡ *De Consensu Evang. L. i. C. i. Lardner's Credibility. Part. ii. V. x. p. 228.*

§ *English Translation, V. ii. page 28, note (d).*

|| See his Introduction to it,

Jewish War. And as ST. MATTHEW wanted not ability nor disposition, we cannot think he wanted inducement, to “do the work of an Evangelist” for his brethren of the common faith, Hellenists as well as Hebrews, to both of whom charity made him a debtor. The popular language of the first believers was Hebrew, what is called so by the sacred and ancient ecclesiastical writers; but they who spoke Greek quickly became a considerable part of the church of CHRIST.

ORIGEN, who, as we have seen above, speaks of ST. MATTHEW’s Gospel as written in Hebrew, seems in his book *on Prayer* to suppose it published by him in Greek too: * for in discoursing on the word *ἐπιούσιον* he considers it as a word formed by the Evangelist himself. EUSEBIUS also, who in one place relates that MATTHEW wrote in Hebrew [Hist. B. iii. C. 24.] † in another remarks, that Chapt. xiii. V. 35. he does not follow *the Seventy*, but as a Hebrew makes his own translation.

4. §. *The second writer of a Gospel was ST. MARK.*

So we have just seen him placed by IRENÆUS and ST. AUGUSTIN. ‡ ORIGEN also, § ST. JEROM, and || COSMAS of *Alexandria* call him the second Evangelist: and in this order he is mentioned by the ancients in general.

5. §. *His Gospel was revised or even dictated by ST. PETER.*

* ST. JEROM tells us, that “MARK the disciple and interpreter of PETER being requested by the brethren at *Rome* wrote a short Gospel according to what he had heard PETER

* See C. clxi. p. 150. Ed. *Reading*.

† Euseb. ap. *Lardner Credib.* V. viii. note (g). p. 180.

‡ See the next article.

§ Prolog. to Comm. on St. Matthew.

|| *Lardner’s Credib.* V. xi. p. 267. Suppl. V. i. p. 178.

* Catal. Viror. illust. in Marco.

“ relate ; and that PETER being informed of this approved it
 “ and delivered it to be read in the church confirmed by his
 “ own authority, as CLEMENS in the sixth book of his *Institutions*, and PAPIAS bishop of *Hierapolis* write.” JUSTIN MARTYR, in his *Dialogue with TRYPHO*, mentioning a circumstance relating to ST. PETER * says, that it is written in his Commentaries, plainly referring to ST. MARK’s Gospel, which only contains the whole passage here cited by JUSTIN. † TERTULLIAN says, “ that the Gospel which was published
 “ by MARK may be esteemed PETER’s, whose interpreter he
 “ was.” ‡ ORIGEN, “ that the second Gospel is that according to MARK, who wrote it as PETER dictated it to him.” § EUSEBIUS, “ PETER testifies these things of himself, for all
 “ things in MARK are said to be memoirs of PETER’s discourses.” || *The Synopsis* ascribed to ATHANASIUS, “ The Gospel according to MARK was dictated by PETER at Rome,
 “ and published by the blessed Apostle MARK.”

6. §. *He wrote for a mixt society of Jews and Gentiles, and probably at Rome or in Italy.*

I find no express testimony of the ancients for this account of his more general plan : but it is intimated by them, when they say, that he wrote at the request of the believers in Rome, under the inspection of ST. PETER. For a part of these believers being Gentiles, ST. PETER certainly paid a just attention to their circumstances ; as in his first general Epistle, dated, as many think, from this same city under the name of *Babylon*, he shows his pastoral care not only for the converted Jews, but for those also, “ Who in time past were not a people

* Page 365. Ed. *Thirlby*. p. 333. Ed. *Paris*. See *Jones’s Method*, Part iv. p. 91.

† Adv. Marcion. L. iv. C. 5.

‡ Ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. L. vi. C. 25.

§ Euseb. Demonst. Evang. L. iii. C. 5. Lardner’s Cred. V. viii. p. 88.

|| Lardner’s Credib. V. viii. p. 250.

“ but

“but now are the people of God,” that is, undoubtedly the Gentiles. See chapt. ii. v. 10.

The evidence concerning the place where this Gospel was composed, part of which has been already given, is thus summed up by Dr. LARDNER * : “CHRYSTOM speaks of its “being written in *Egypt*. But he is almost singular. That “it was written at *Rome* or in *Italy*, is said not only by EPIPHANIUS, JEROME, GREGORY NAZIANZEN, VICTOR, and “divers others : but the *Egyptian* writers likewise all along “say the same thing, that it was written by MARK at *Rome* “in the company of the Apostle PETER. So say CLEMENT “of *Alexandria*, ATHANASIUS, the supposed author of the “*Synopsis of Scripture*, COSMAS and ENTYCHIVS, all of *Alexandria*. EBEDJESU likewise in his *Catalogue of Syrian Writings*, says, that MARK wrote at *Rome*.”

7. §. *The third writer of a Gospel was ST. LUKE.*

“He appears to have written after MATTHEW and MARK, “according to the judgement of almost all both ancients and “moderns, as IRENÆUS, iii. 1. TERTULLIAN against MARCION, iv. 5. EUSEBIUS, Hist. iii. 24. AUGUSTIN, concerning the consent of the Evangelists, ii. 2, &c. GROTIUS “thinks he hath observed him treading in the steps of MARK, “† i. 4. and 23. ii. 12, 21. iv. 20, 21. vi. 14. xii. 40. &c. “CLEMENS of *Alexandria*, as quoted by EUSEBIUS, Hist. vi. “14. is the only one [of the Ancients] who seems to place “him before MARK, by saying, that the Gospels which contain the Genealogies were first written.” FABRICIUS, *Bibl. Græc.* B. iv. C. 5. §. 4.

* Lardner's Supplement, V. i. p. 184.

† These references are to chapters of St. Mark.

8. §. *He wrote with a more peculiar view to the converted Gentiles, and probably in Achaia.*

* “The third Gospel,” says ORIGEN, “is that according to LUKE, commended by PAUL, composed for the converted Gentiles.” † And FABRICIUS observes, that there is a wonderful agreement of the ancients in making ST. LUKE the interpreter and attendant of ST. PAUL, as ST. MARK of ST. PETER. * It is said by IRENÆUS, that LUKE wrote the Gospel which PAUL preached: and by ‡ TERTULLIAN, that “some made PAUL the author of his Gospel, because it is reasonable to ascribe to the master the works published by the disciple.” ST. CHRYSOSTOM, as was § before mentioned, finds in it the stile of ST. PAUL. || In the *Synopsis* ascribed to ATHANASIUS it is affirmed, that “the Gospel of LUKE was dictated by the Apostle PAUL, and written and published by the blessed Apostle and Physician LUKE.”

Some suppose him to have written it at *Alexandria* in *Egypt*; but in the judgement of * DUPIN, with which † Dr. LARDNER concurs, we ought to adhere to what ST. JEROM has said of it as most reasonable, that LUKE composed it in *Achaia* or *Bæotia*. ‡ GREGORY NAZIANZEN agrees with ST. JEROM, and describes where the three first Gospels were written in the following distich.

Ματθαῖος μὲν ἔγραψεν Ἑβραίοις θαύματα Χριστοῦ,
Μάρκος δ' Ἰταλίῃ, Λουκᾶς Ἀχαΐᾃ.

MATTHEW wrote the Miracles of CHRIST for the Jews,
MARK for Italy, LUKE for Achaia.

* See in *Mill* the testimonies before St. Luke.

† *Bibl. Græc.* B. iv. C. 5. p. 133.

‡ *Advers. Marcion.* L. iv. C. 5.

§ Sermon, p. 12.

|| *Lardner's Credibil.* V. viii. p. 250.

* *Can. of Scripture.* V. ii. C. ii. Sect. v. p. 46.

† *Supplement,* V. i. p. 277.

‡ *Credibility,* V. ix. p. 133.

9. §. ST. JOHN *had seen the three former Gospels, and bore testimony to the truth of them.*

* EUSEBIUS relates, that the three first-written Gospels being published to the world and known to JOHN, he is said to have approved them, and confirmed the truth of them with his own testimony. The same account is given by † ST. JEROM, and by ‡ SOPHRONIUS from him, by THEODORUS of *Mopsuestia*, and by § COSMAS of *Alexandria*.

10. §. *He wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem at Ephesus or in Asia Minor.*

|| IRENÆUS tells us, that “JOHN published his Gospel to root out the errors sown among men by CERINTHUS, and long before by those who are called *Nicolaitans*.” If he says elsewhere, that JOHN composed his Gospel “foreseeing by the Spirit the divisions of evil teachers,” I find no inconsistency in the two accounts. He may suppose ST. JOHN to have foreseen that other evil teachers would follow CERINTHUS, and to have provided both an antidote against future heresy, and a remedy for that which actually existed. * ST. JEROM concurs with IRENÆUS in saying, that “JOHN the Apostle wrote a Gospel at the request of the bishops of *Asia* against CERINTHUS and other heretics, and especially against the doctrine of the *Ebionites* then springing up, that CHRIST had no being till he was born of MARY.” † This doctrine is said to have begun among the Christians at *Pella*, A. D. LXXI, the year after the destruction of *Jerusalem*; but ‡ CERINTHUS is

* Eccl. Hist. B. ii. C. 24.

† Catal. Script. Eccles.

‡ For Sophronius and Theodorus see before St. John's Gospel in *Mill*.

§ *Lardner's Credib.* V. xi. p. 265. Supplem. V. i. p. 388.

|| B. iii. C. xi. p. 218. Edit. *Grabe*. B. iii. C. xviii. p. 241.

* Catal. Scriptorum Eccles. n. 20.

† *Cave's Hist. Literar. Conspectus Saccl. Apost.* p. 1.

‡ *Ib.* p. 36.

placed

placed about A. D. LXXX. IRENÆUS therefore supposed ST. JOHN to have written some years after the destruction of *Jerusalem*. Perhaps it may not be necessary, with * EPIPHANIUS, to make it so late as when he was ninety years old. And yet even at that advanced age many have retained great vigour of understanding, and even of memory, especially with regard to the occurrences of their earlier days: and whenever ST. JOHN wrote, it was of a subject graven deep on his mind by constant meditation and daily discourse of it. † IRENÆUS says further, that he published his Gospel at *Ephesus*; and it seems allowed by all, that he did it in some part of *Asia Minor*. ‡ THEODORUS of *Mopsuestia*, and § COSMAS of *Alexandria* inform us, that his usual residence was at *Ephesus*.

The earlier fathers leave us most to seek concerning the precise times in which the Gospels were written. With regard to order and place they are more explicit. And ISIDORE of *Seville*, who lived about A. D. DLXXXV. delivers their sentiments in in general as well as his own in the following passage.

|| “ Of the four Evangelists the first and last relate what
 “ they had heard CHRIST say or seen him perform. The
 “ other two, placed between them, relate those things which
 “ they had learned from Apostles. MATTHEW wrote his
 “ Gospel first, in *Judea*; then MARK, in *Italy*; LUKE the
 “ third, in *Achaia*; JOHN the last, in *Asia*.”

* Hæres. 41. n. 12. p. 432. Ed. *Cologn*. 1682.

† B. iii. C. i.

‡ See *Mill* before St. John's Gospel.

§ *Lard*. Suppl. V. i. p. 388.

|| *Ib.* p. 223.

Ancient Writers mentioned in this Discourse, and the Times, according to Dr. CAVE, in which they flourished.

Papias	—	—	—	—	—	A. D.	110
Justin Martyr	—	—	—	—	—	—	140
Irenæus	—	—	—	—	—	—	167
Tertullian	—	—	—	—	—	—	192
Clemens of Alexandria	—	—	—	—	—	—	192
Origen	—	—	—	—	—	—	230
Eusebius	—	—	—	—	—	—	315
Athanasius	—	—	—	—	—	—	326
Epiphanius	—	—	—	—	—	—	368
Gregory Nazianzen	—	—	—	—	—	—	370
St. Jerom	—	—	—	—	—	—	378
Sophronius	—	—	—	—	—	—	390
St. Augustin	—	—	—	—	—	—	396
St. Chrysostom	—	—	—	—	—	—	398
Victor of Antioch	—	—	—	—	—	—	401
Theodorus of Mopsuestia	—	—	—	—	—	—	407
Cosmas of Alexandria	—	—	—	—	—	—	535
Eutychius	—	—	—	—	—	—	553
Isidore of Seville	—	—	—	—	—	—	595
Theophylact	—	—	—	—	—	—	1077
Euthymius	—	—	—	—	—	—	1116
Ebedjesu	—	—	—	—	—	—	1300

DISCOURSE THE THIRD.

Preparations for determining the Order of the Evangelists by internal Evidence.

S E C T. I.

The question proposed, Whether the following Evangelists had seen the foregoing Gospels.

I SHALL now attempt to confirm the foregoing articles by proofs taken from the Gospels themselves.

But the argument from internal evidence is so connected in many instances with the question, *Whether the succeeding Evangelists had seen the former Gospels*, that it is first necessary to consider this question. And the great use of deciding it must be my apology for the length of debating it.

It may be taken for granted, at least for the present, that ST. JOHN had seen the Gospels written before his own. The inquiry is limited to ST. MATTHEW, ST. MARK, and ST. LUKE: from whose Gospels I will first bring together some parallel passages with a few remarks intermixt; and then examine what conclusion we may justly draw from the uniformity of these passages.

The comparisons are made in our common version. But the reader will perceive, that here and there a word is altered. This was done chiefly because the translators have sometimes rendered the same words by different, or different by the same; and

DISCOURSE III. SECT. II. 35

and I was desirous of giving as exact an idea as I could of the agreement of the texts * in the places compared.

S E C T. II.

Parallel Passages of ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK.

1. §. Matth. iv. 17—22.

Mark i. 14—20.

17. *From that time JESUS began to preach and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand.*

14. *JESUS came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of GOD,*

15. *And saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of GOD is at hand: repent ye and believe the gospel.*

18. *And JESUS walking by the sea of Galilee saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother casting a net into the sea (FOR THEY WERE FISHERS;)*

16. *Now as he was going by the sea of Galilee, he saw two brethren, Simon*

and Andrew his brother, casting a net in the sea (FOR THEY WERE FISHERS;)

19. *And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.*

17. *And JESUS said unto them, Follow me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.*

20. *And straightway they left their nets, and followed him.*

18. *And straightway they left their nets, and followed him.*

* They who would judge from the originals will find some of the following instances standing collaterally in the Harmonies which have been published in Greek. The accuracy of Monsieur TOINARD's is such, that the smallest agreement or variation of the texts may be seen with the greatest facility in all parts of the Gospels which he deems to be parallel. See also the learned Dr. OWEN's valuable *Observations on the Four Gospels*: in which a number of passages are compared in Greek; either the same, or to the same purpose as these which are here compared in English.

Matth. iv. 17—22.

21. *And going on from thence
he saw other two brethren
James the son of Zebedee
and John his brother
in a ship
with Zebedee their father
mending their nets :
and he called them.*

22. *And they straightway left
the ship and their father
and followed him.*

Mark i. 14—20.

19. *And going on from thence
a little farther he saw
James the son of Zebedee
and John his brother
who also were in a ship*

mending their nets.

20. *And straightway he called
them :*

*and they left
their father Zebedee in the ship
with the hired servants
and went after him.*

ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK, who pass over what our LORD did in Judea and other parts in the interval between his Temptation and JOHN's imprisonment, both open the history of his public ministry with the calling of ST. PETER, which they relate in the same words, even to the parenthesis, FOR THEY WERE FISHERS.

But this is, as it were, the surface of their conformity, which goes deeper. For this calling of ST. PETER is, * in the judgement of many learned commentators and harmonists, the very same which ST. LUKE thus describes.

Ch. v. *And it came to pass, that as the people pressed upon him to hear the word of GOD, he stood by the lake of Gennefareth,*

And saw two ships standing by the lake : but the fishermen were gone out of them, and were washing their nets.

* Grotius, Hammond, on the place. Spanheim. Dub. Evangel. Par. iii. Dub. 72. pag. 338. Chemnitius, Cradock, Lightfoot, Le Clerc, Doddridge, in their Harmonies. Spanheim has particularly considered and answered the chief objections. One remark of Spanheim is, Non temerè multiplicandas esse historias, quæ eandem deprehenduntur, quod cum Osiandro sine necessitate faciunt illi, qui nullas ὑπερώτας et ἀλλήλας apud sacros scriptores admittunt.

And

And he entered into one of the ships, which was Simon's, and prayed him that he would thrust out a little from the land. And he sat down and taught the people out of the ship.

Now when he had left speaking, he said unto Simon, Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught.

And Simon answering said unto him, Master, we have toiled all night and have taken nothing: nevertheless at thy word I will let down the net.

And when they had this done; they inclosed a great multitude of fishes, and their net brake.

And they beckoned unto their partners which were in the other ship, that they should come and help them. And they came and filled both the ships, so that they began to sink.

When Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus knees, saying, Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.

For he was astonished and all that were with him at the draught of fishes which they had taken.

And so was also James and John the sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men.

And when they had brought their ships to land, they forsook all and followed him.

This account will be found on a near inspection to tally marvellously with the preceding, and to be one of the evidences, that the Evangelists vary only in the number or choice of circumstances, and write from the same idea of the fact which they lay before us. Every one knows, that the *Sea of Galilee*, and the *Lake of Gennesareth* are the same. And though ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK do not expressly tell us, that ST. PETER was in his vessel when he was called by CHRIST, they signify as much in saying, that *he was casting a net into the sea*; for this supposes him to be aboard, and our LORD in the vessel with him, as ST. LUKE relates. The latter does not mention ST. ANDREW, either here or elsewhere, except in giving the
catalogue

catalogue of the Apostles, vi. 14. and perhaps may design to suggest, that the prophetic promise of *catching men*, principally respected ST. PETER. However the sense of this promise is precisely the same with that of being *fishers of men*. Again, ST. LUKE tells us, that JAMES and JOHN the sons of ZEBEDEE assisted PETER in landing the fish which he had taken; and that *when they*, that is, the four partners, *had brought their ships to land, they forsook all, and followed CHRIST*. And here also this Evangelist harmonizes with the two others. ST. MARK says, that *When CHRIST had gone a little farther thence*, from the place where PETER and ANDREW began to follow him, *he saw JAMES the son of ZEBEDEE and JOHN his brother, who ALSO were in a ship, * as PETER had been when he was called, mending their nets*, their nets torn by the weight of fish which they had hauled to shore, *and straightway he called them—and they went after him*, in company with PETER and ANDREW.

The two accounts, that of ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK on one side and that of ST. LUKE on the other, thus concurring in the place and situation in which ST. PETER was called, in the promise made to him, and the time when he was called, speak evidently of the same vocation. Consequently ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK have abridged the story. And the very same abridgement of it being found in both, the inference to be drawn from their agreement scarce needs any proof, but what this example furnishes.

Only one circumstance is peculiar to ST. MARK, that JOHN and JAMES left their father ZEBEDEE *in the ship* WITH THE HIRED SERVANTS: which shows, that CHRIST in calling them, and They in obeying the call, did not leave the father destitute of assistance to carry on his business. A circumstance

* I see not what else ALSO can refer to. *Καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ πλοίῳ* is the original: the latter part of which I have rendered, *In a ship*; as our Translators do the same words, in Matth. iv. 21. So *De Beaufobre* and *L'Enfant*, Dans une barque.

worthy to be noted by an Evangelist who wrote, either where it was not known, or when it might be forgotten.

The argument, as far as it turns on identity of language in comparing ST. MATTHEW with ST. MARK or ST. LUKE, supposes the originality of ST. MATTHEW'S Greek. This learned moderns have maintained so strenuously, as to deny, that he wrote also in Hebrew. Without intermeddling with the latter question, I hope to confirm the former by a few observations, which will arise here and there in the course of this work.

2. §. Matth. xiii. 1—9.

1. *The same day went JESUS out of the house, and sat by the sea-side,*

2. *And great multitudes were gathered together unto him, so that he went into a ship, and sat, and the whole multitude stood on the shore.*

3. *And he spake many things unto them in parables, saying*

Behold,

A sower went forth to sow,

4. *And when he sowed,*

some fell by the way-side,

and the fowls came,

and devoured them up.

5. *And some fell on stony ground, where they had not much earth, and forthwith they sprang up, because they had no deepness of earth:*

Mark iv. 1—9.

1. *And he began to teach*

by the sea-side,

and a great multitude was gathered together unto him, so that he went into a ship and sat, and the whole multitude was by the sea on the land.

2. *And he taught them many things in parables, and said unto them in his doctrine,*

3. *Hearken, Behold,*

A sower went forth to sow,

4. *And it came to pass when he sowed,*

some fell by the way-side,

and the fowls of the air came

and devoured it up.

5. *And some fell on stony ground, where it had not much earth, and forthwith it sprang up, because it had no deepness of earth:*

6. *And*

Matth. xiii. 1—9.

Mark iv. 1—9.

6. *And the sun being up they were scorched, and because they had not root, they withered away.*

7. *And some fell among thorns, and the thorns sprang up and choked them.*

8. *But other fell on good ground, and brought forth fruit,*

some an hundred-fold, some sixty-fold, some thirty-fold.

9. *Who hath ears to hear let him hear.*

6. *And when the sun was up it was scorched, and because it had not root, it withered away.*

7. *And some fell among thorns, and the thorns sprang up and choked it, and it yielded no fruit.*

8. *And other fell on good ground, and brought forth fruit, that sprang up and increased, and yielded*

some thirty-fold, some sixty-fold, and some an hundred-fold.

9. *And he said unto them, Who hath ears to hear let him hear.*

In relating this parable, ST. MARK has here and there supplied a word or small circumstance omitted by ST. MATTHEW; in speaking of the seed that was sown he has altered the plural to the singular, * as in the explication he makes just the contrary change; and he has inverted the close of the sentence in verse 8. These little variations in a few places make it evident, that such exact concurrence as we observe in the rest was not requisite to a just representation of the parable: which will appear in a stronger light to the learned reader who will consult the Greek text of LUKE viii. 1—8, and compare it with these, particularly in the seventh verse of all three.

The parable was delivered in public and followed by several others spoken at the same time. The Evangelists however all agree to suspend the narration of them, and to insert the ex-

* V. 19—23. of Matth. v. 14—20. of Mark.

DISCOURSE III. SECT. II. 41

position of this, * which was not given till afterwards to the disciples in private.

3. §. Matth. xx. 24—28.

24. *And when the Ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren.*

25. *But JESUS called them unto him, and said,*

Ye know that they which rule over the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them.

26. *But it shall not be so among you. But whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister :*

27. *And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant :*

28. *Even as the son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.*

Mark x. 41—45.

41. *And when the Ten heard it, they began to be moved with indignation*

against James and John.

42. *But JESUS called them unto him, and saith unto them,*

Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they of them that are great exercise authority upon them.

43. *But it shall not be so among you. But whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister :*

44. *And whosoever will be chief among you, shall be servant of all :*

45. *For even the son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.*

The likeness or rather sameness of expression in these paragraphs is too visible to need any remarks upon it.

* Mark iv. 10,

F

4. §. Matth.

4. §. Matth. xxi. 23—27.

23. *And when he was come into the Temple, the chief priests, and the elders of the people, come unto him, as he was teaching, and said,*

By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?

24. *And JESUS answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye will tell me, I in likewise will tell you by what authority I do these things.*

25. *The baptism of John, whence was it? from Heaven or of Men?*

And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, from Heaven, he will say unto us, Why then did ye not believe him?

26. *But if we shall say, Of men, we fear the people: for all hold John as a prophet.*

27. *And they answered JESUS and said, We cannot tell.*

Mark xi. 27—33.

27. *And as he was walking in the Temple, the chief priests and the scribes, and the elders come unto him*

28. *And say unto him, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority to do these things?*

29. *And JESUS answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, and answer me, and I will tell you, by what authority I do these things.*

30. *The baptism of John, was it from Heaven or of men? answer me.*

31. *And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, from Heaven, he will say, Why then did ye not believe him?*

32. *But if we shall say, Of men, they feared the people: for all held John that he was a prophet indeed.*

33. *And they answered and said unto JESUS, We cannot tell.*

And

Matth. xxi. 23—27.

*And he said unto them,**Neither tell I you, by what authority I do these things.*

Mark xi. 27—33.

*And JESUS answering saith unto them,**Neither tell I you, by what authority I do these things.*

The rulers, who conferred among themselves on the question proposed to them, were all of one mind about the difficulty of answering it; but did not all express the danger of owning their real sentiments in the same terms; for while some said, WE FEAR THE PEOPLE, others declared, ALL THE PEOPLE WILL STONE US. LUKE XX. 6. There was therefore, at least in this particular, a liberty of varying in words without departing from the truth.

5. §. Matth. xxiv. 32—35.

32. Now learn a parable of the fig-tree; when her branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh:

33. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things,

know that it is near, even at the doors.

34. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled.

35. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

Mark xiii. 28—31.

28. Now learn a parable of the fig-tree; when her branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh:

29. So likewise ye, when ye shall see these things come to pass,

know that it is near, even at the doors.

30. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass until all these things be fulfilled.

31. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

Luke xxi. 29. And he spake unto them a parable: Behold the fig-tree AND ALL THE TREES.

30. *When they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves, that summer is now nigh at hand.*

31. *So likewise ye, when ye shall see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of GOD is nigh at hand.*

The opening of the parable, as it stands in ST. LUKE, shows that CHRIST did not instance in the budding of the fig-tree only, but of that AND ALL THE TREES, as a sign of approaching summer.

6. §. Matth. xxvii. 39—44.

Mark xv. 29—32.

39. *And they that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads,*

40. *And saying, Thou that destroyest the Temple, save thyself; if thou be the Son of GOD come down from the cross.*

41. *Likewise also the chief priests mocking said with the scribes and elders,*

42. *He saved others, himself he cannot save.*

If he be the king of Israel

let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him.

43. *He trusted in GOD; let him deliver him now if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of GOD.*

44. *After the same manner also*

29. *And they that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads,*

and saying, Ah!

Thou that destroyest the Temple,

30. *Save thyself, and*

come down from the cross.

31. *Likewise also the chief priests mocking said among themselves with the scribes,*

He saved others, himself he cannot save.

32. *The CHRIST, the king of Israel*

let him now come down from the cross, that we may see and believe.

the

DISCOURSE III. SECT. II. 45

Matth. xxvii. 39—44.

*the thieves that were crucified
with him, reviled him.*

Mark xv. 29—32.

*And they that were crucified
with him, reviled him.*

I will here place ST. LUKE's account of the same things
opposite to ST. MARK's.

Mark xv. 29—32.

Luke xxiii. 35—40.

35. *And the people stood behold-
ing,*

29. *And they that passed by rail-
ed on him, wagging their heads
and saying, Ah! thou that de-
stroyest the Temple, and buildest
it in three days,*

30. *Save thyself and come down
from the cross.*

31. *Likewise also the chief priests
mocking, said among themselves
with the scribes,*

*He saved others,
himself he cannot save.*

32. *The CHRIST,
the king of Israel,
let him now come down from the
cross, that we may see and believe.*

*and the rulers also with them
derided him, saying,*

*He saved others,
let him save himself,
if he be CHRIST
the chosen of GOD.*

36. *And the soldiers also mocked
him, coming to him, and offer-
ing him vinegar,*

37. *And saying, If thou be the
king of the Jews, save thyself.*

* * * * *

*And they that were crucified with
him reviled him.*

39. *And one of the malefactors,
which were hanged, railed on him,
saying,*

Mark xv. 29—32.

Luke xxiii. 35—40.

*saying, If thou be the CHRIST,
save thyself and us.*

*40. But the other answering re-
buked him.*

We perceive by this last comparison, that ST. LUKE differs a little in expression from ST. MARK; that he mentions the insult of the foldiers, of which the other takes no notice; and that he is much more distinct in the history of the two crucified thieves. It is therefore to be considered, why ST. MARK, from whom ST. LUKE thus varies, accords so entirely with ST. MATTHEW in relating the same train of particulars in the same language.

I must beg leave to observe on this occasion, that the Evangelists have represented the different taunts of *Jews* and *Romans* with the most precise adherence to propriety and truth. The *Jews* reviled our LORD as pretending to be KING OF ISRAEL. * So they constantly spoke of their *Messiah*. The *Roman* foldiers derided him as KING OF THE JEWS: † which was the title always used by the Gentiles for the same person. Thus the Wise Men, who came to worship our SAVIOUR at his nativity, inquired after him, *Where is he that is born KING OF THE JEWS?* And this is a sufficient proof, that they were not *Jews* themselves, as a late learned Commentator on the Gospels supposes them to have been. *Matth. ii. 1.*

* See Matth. xxvii. 42. Mark xv. 32. John i. 49. xii. 13.

† Matth. ii. 2. xxvii. 11. 29. 37. Mark xv. 2. 9. 12. 18. 26. Luke xxiii. 3. 37. 38. John xviii. 33. 39. xix. 3. 19.

S E C T. III.

Parallel passages of ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE.

1. §. Matth. iii. 7—12.

Luke iii. 7—9. 16, 17.

7. *But when he saw many of the Pharisees, and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them,*

O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come ?

8. *Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance,*

9. *And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father : for I say unto you, that GOD is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.*

10. *And now also the ax is laid unto the root of the trees : therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.*

11. *I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance : but he that cometh after me is mightier than I,*

7. *Then said he to the multitudes that came forth to be baptized of him,*

O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come ?

8. *Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance, and begin not*

to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father : for I say unto you, that GOD is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.

9. *And now also the ax is laid unto the root of the trees : therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.*

* * * * *

16. *John answered, saying unto them all,*

I indeed baptize you with water, but one cometh mightier than I,

whose

48 DISCOURSE III. SECT. III.

Matth. iii. 7—12.

*whose shoes I am not worthy
to bear :
he shall baptize you with
the HOLY GHOST and with fire.
12. Whose fan is in his hand,
and he will thoroughly purge
his floor, and gather his wheat
into the garner ; but he will
burn up the chaff with
unquenchable fire.*

Luke iii. 7—9. 16, 17.

*the latchet of whose shoes, I
am not worthy to unloose :
he shall baptize you with
the HOLY GHOST, and with fire.
17. Whose fan is in his hand,
and he will thoroughly purge
his floor, and gather his wheat
into his garner ; but he will
burn up the chaff with
unquenchable fire.*

Mark i. 7, 8. *And [John] preached, saying, There cometh
one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes
I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose.*

*I indeed have baptized you with water : but he shall
baptize you with the HOLY GHOST.*

If we except the substitution of THE MULTITUDES for MANY OF THE PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES, * the reason of which will appear hereafter ; and that ST. LUKE varies from ST. MATTHEW, as he does from himself [Acts xiii. 25.] in the proverbial phrase of *bearing* or *loosing* the shoes ; this summary of the Baptist's instructions, as far as it is recited by ST. MATTHEW, stands sentence for sentence, and almost word for word the same in ST. LUKE. Yet JOHN not only said "*many*" "*other things in his exhortation to the people,*" but sometimes delivered these very things in another order, as may be seen by the short paragraph of ST. MARK subjoined to the other two.

2. §. Matth. xi. 2—11.

Luke vii. 19—28.

2. *Now when John had heard in the prison the works of* 19. *And John calling unto him two of his*
CHRIST,

* Disc. vi. Sect. 1.

sending

Matth. xi. 2—11.

*sending two of his disciples,*3. *He said unto him,**Art thou he that should come,
or look we for another?*4. *Then JESUS answering said
unto them, Go your way,
and tell John what things
ye do hear and see.*5. *The blind see, and the lame
walk,**the lepers are cleansed,**the deaf hear,**the dead are raised,**and the poor have the gospel
preached unto them.*6. *And blessed is he whosoever
shall not be offended in me.*7. *And when these were gone,
JESUS began**to say to the multitudes concer-
ning John,**What went ye out into the
wilderness for to see?**a reed shaken with the wind?*

Luke vii. 19—28.

*disciples, sent them unto JESUS,
saying,**Art thou he that should come,
or look we for another?*20. *When the men were come
unto him, they said, John Baptist
bath sent us unto thee, saying,
Art thou he that should come, or
look we for another?*21. *And in that same hour he
cured many of their infirmities,
and plagues, and of evil spirits;
and unto many that were blind he
gave sight.*22. *Then JESUS answering said
unto them, Go your way,
and tell John what things
ye have seen and heard.**The blind see, the lame walk,**the lepers are cleansed,**the deaf hear,**the dead are raised,**the poor have the gospel
preached unto them.*23. *And blessed is he whosoever
shall not be offended in me.*24. *And when the messengers
of John were departed, he began
to say to the multitudes concer-
ning John,**What went ye out into the
wilderness for to see?**a reed shaken with the wind?*

G

8. But

50 DISCOURSE III. SECT. III.

Matth. xi. 2—11.

8. *But what went ye out for to see?*

a man clothed in soft raiment? Behold they that wear soft clothing are in king's houses.

9. *But what went ye out for to see?*

a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet.

10. *For this is he of whom it is written,*

Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

11. *Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater*

than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven, is greater than he.

Luke vii. 19—28.

25. *But what went ye out for to see?*

a man clothed in soft raiment? Behold they that are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately are in king's courts.

26. *But what went ye out for to see?*

a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet.

27. *This is he of whom it is written,*

Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

28. *For I say unto you, Among them that are born of women, there is not a greater*

prophet than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of God, is greater than he.

ST. MATTHEW, who as usually hastens on to the discourse of CHRIST, only intimates in these words, "*Go your way, and tell John what things ye do hear and see,*" that our LORD at that time did many miracles. This ST. LUKE declares in express terms. In other respects the relation is almost verbatim the same in both Evangelists.

3. §. Matth. xi. 21—23.

Luke x. 13—15.

21. *Wo unto thee Chorazin;
Wo unto thee Bethsaida:
for if the mighty works which
were done in you, had been done
in Tyre and Sidon, they
would have repented long ago,
in sackcloth and ashes.*

22. *But I say unto you, it
shall be more tolerable for
Tyre and Sidon at the day of
judgement than for you.*

23. *And thou Capernaum,
which art exalted unto heaven
shalt be brought down to hell.*

13. *Wo unto thee Chorazin;
Wo unto thee Bethsaida:
for if the mighty works which
were done in you, had been done
in Tyre and Sidon, they
would have repented long ago,
sitting in sackcloth and ashes.*

14. *But it
shall be more tolerable for
Tyre and Sidon at the day of
judgement than for you.*

15. *And thou Capernaum,
which art exalted unto heaven
shalt be brought down to hell.*

Though CHRIST must have often visited *Chorazin* and *Bethsaida*, the two Evangelists no where take notice that he had been at either. * Yet ST. LUKE is apt to order and dispose his narration in such a manner, that the preceding part may illustrate the subsequent. And this makes his correspondence with ST. MATTHEW in relating the *wo* denounced against these cities the more remarkable.

4. §. Matth. xxiv. 45—51.

Luke xii. 42—46.

45. *Who then is that faithful
and wise servant, whom his Lord
hath made ruler over his house-
hold to give them meat
in due season?*

46. *Blessed is that servant whom*

42. *Who then is that faithful
and wise steward, whom his Lord
shall make ruler over his house-
hold, to give them their portion of
meat in due season?*

43. *Blessed is that servant whom*

* See Disc. vi. Sect. 1.

52 DISCOURSE III. SECT. III.

Matth. xxiv. 45—51.

his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing.

47. *Verily I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all his goods.*

48. *But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming ;*

49. *And shall begin to smite his fellow servants and to eat and drink with the drunken ;*

50. *The Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not ware of,*

51. *And shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites.*

Luke xii. 42—46.

his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing.

44. *Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all his goods.*

45. *But and if that servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming ;*

and shall begin to smite the men servants and maidens and to eat and drink and be drunken ;

46. *The Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not ware of,*

47. *And shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the unbelievers.*

This monition, and the denunciation just mentioned were twice delivered. ST. MATTHEW recites them as spoken on one occasion, ST. LUKE on another ; yet there is hardly any variation of language between them, till we come to the two last words of the latter parallel ; where we find HYPOCRITES in ST. MATTHEW, and UNBELIEVERS in ST. LUKE. It is very possible * that CHRIST might mention both ; and each Evangelist chose the term that was most to his purpose. If each wrote with a view to different classes of converts, the very nature of his design must occasion such small diversities : which cannot affect the conclusion to be drawn from their accordance.

* So Grotius supposes on Matth. xxiv. 51.

SECT.

S E C T. IV.

Parallel passages of ST. MARK and ST. LUKE.

1. §. Mark i. 21—30.

Luke iv. 31—38.

21. *And they went into Capernaum ;*

31. *And [he] came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and was teaching them on the sabbath-day.*

and straightway on the sabbath-day he entred into the synagogue, and taught.

22. *And they were astonished at his doctrine : for he taught them as one that had authority, and not as the scribes.*

32. *And they were astonished at his doctrine : for his word was with authority.*

23. *And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit,*

33. *And there was in the synagogue a man which had a spirit of an unclean devil,*

and he cried out,

and he cried out with a loud voice,

24. *Saying, Let us alone ; what have we to do with thee, thou JESUS of Nazareth ? Art thou come to destroy us ? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of GOD.*

34. *Saying, Let us alone ; what have we to do with thee, thou JESUS of Nazareth ? art thou come to destroy us ? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of GOD.*

25. *And JESUS rebuked him, saying,*

35. *And JESUS rebuked him, saying,*

Holdthypeace and come out of him.

Holdthypeace and come out of him.

26. *And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice,*

And when the devil had thrown him in the midst,

be

Mark i. 21—30.

*he came out of him.*27. *And they were all amazed,**insomuch that they questioned
among themselves, saying,**What thing is this?**What new doctrine is this?**for with authority**he commandeth even the**unclean spirits,**and they obey him.*28. *And immediately his fame**spread abroad throughout**all the region round about**Galilee.*

Luke iv. 31—38.

*he came out of him**and hurt him not.*36. *And they were all in amaze-
ment,**and spake among themselves,
saying,**What a word is this?**for with authority and power**he commandeth the**unclean spirits,**and they come out.*37. *And a report concerning him**went out into every place of**the region round about.*

This miracle, recited only by ST. MARK and ST. LUKE, is the first miraculous cure mentioned by either of them: though CHRIST had done some before in this very city of *Caper-naum*. [LUKE iv. 23.] It is prefaced in both with the same observation on the authority of his doctrine, and closed with the same remark on the spreading of his fame. Which remark is the more to be noted in ST. LUKE, as it was said by him a little above, v. 14. “*And there went out a fame of him through all the region round about;*” * and he is very sparing of repetitions.

The first word of the demoniac’s speech, *EA*, which is translated, *Let us alone*, † is in the opinion of able critics not a verb, but Greek interjection, not often found in prose writers, and no where else in the New Testament: which made GROTIUS not hesitate to say, that here certainly LUKE copied MARK, with the change only of a few words.

* See Disc. iv. Sect. v. §. 6. note.

† Raphelii Annotat. in Marc. i. 24.

ST. LUKE makes no comparison of CHRIST with the Scribes, but says only, that "*His word was with authority.*"

* This is agreeable to his method of deferring to name what he cannot yet explain.

2. §. Mark x. 17—20.

Luke xviii. 18—21.

17. *And when he was gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him,*

Good master what shall I do, that I may inherit eternal life?

18. *And JESUS said unto him, Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, GOD.*

19. *Thou knowest the commandments,*

*Do not commit adultery,
Do not kill, Do not steal,
Do not bear false witness,
Defraud not,*

Honour thy father and mother.

20. *And he answered and said unto him,*

Master all these things have I observed from my youth.

18. *And a certain ruler asked him, saying,*

Good master what having done shall I inherit eternal life?

19. *And JESUS said unto him, Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, GOD.*

20. *Thou knowest the commandments,*

*Do not commit adultery,
Do not kill, Do not steal,
Do not bear false witness,*

Honour thy father and mother.

21. *And he said,*

All these things have I observed from my youth.

The circumstance, that "*When JESUS was gone forth into the way there came one running and kneeled to him,*" is one of those little incidents that characterize the narration of a beholder. Of these there are many in ST. MARK, which ST. LUKE would naturally omit. Otherwise there is a perfect uni-

* See Disc. vi. Sect. i.

formity in the two passages; and it is distinguished by an inversion of the sixth and seventh commandments, and a translation of them different from the *Septuagint*, which ST. LUKE usually follows. The *Septuagint* says, and ST. MATTHEW here agrees with it, *Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not commit adultery*; ST. MARK, and ST. LUKE, *Do not commit adultery, Do not kill*.

In another place they both deviate a little from ST. MATTHEW and the *Septuagint*, who say, *Thou shalt love the LORD thy GOD with all thy heart and with all thy soul*; to which they add, *And with all thy strength*. Deut. v. 6. Matth. xxii. 37. Mark xii. 30. Luke x. 27.

3. §. Mark xii. 38—40.

38. *And he said unto them in his doctrine,*

Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and salutations in the market places,

39. *And the chief seats in the synagogues,*

and the uppermost rooms at feasts,

40. *Devouring widows houses, and for a pretence making long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation.*

Luke xx. 45—47.

45. *Then in the audience of all the people, he said unto his disciples,*

46. *Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and love salutations in the markets,*

and the chief seats in the synagogues,

and the uppermost rooms at feasts,

47. *Which devour widows houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation.*

There are two things in this parallel which deserve our attention.

1. Our LORD delivered a much longer discourse on the subject of the Scribes and Pharisees [Matth. xxiii.] out of which both Evangelists have selected these particulars only.

2. They

2. They coincide in the arrangement of them; which in one place exactly inverts the order of ST. MATTHEW. This ST. LUKE rarely does, and then chiefly in conjunction with ST. MARK.

Matth. xxiii. 6, 7.

*And love the uppermost rooms at feasts,
and the chief seats in the synagogues,
and salutations in the markets.*

Mark. Luke.

*And love salutations in the markets,
and the chief seats in the synagogues,
And the uppermost rooms at feasts.*

4. §. Mark xiv. 13—16.

13. *And he sendeth two of his disciples,*

*and saith unto them,
Go ye into the city, and*

*there shall meet you a man
bearing a pitcher of water:
follow him.*

14. *And wheresoever he shall go in,*

say ye to the good-man;

*The master saith,
Where is the guest-chamber,
where I shall eat the passover
with my disciples?*

Luke xxii. 8—13.

8. *And he sent PETER and JOHN,
saying, Go and prepare us the
passover that we may eat.*

9. *And they said unto him,
Where wilt thou that we pre-
pare?*

10. *And he said unto them,
Behold, when ye are entred into
the city,*

*there shall meet you a man
bearing a pitcher of water:
follow him into the house,*

where he entreth in.

11. *And ye shall say to the good-
man of the house,*

*The master saith unto thee,
Where is the guest-chamber,
where I shall eat the passover
with my disciples?*

H

15. And

58 DISCOURSE III. SECT. IV.

Mark xiv. 13—16.

Luke xxii. 8—13.

15. *And he will show you a large upper-room furnished and prepared:*

there make ready.

16. *And his disciples went, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them;*

and they made ready the passover.

12. *And he will show you a large upper-room furnished:*

there make ready.

13. *And they went,*

and found as he had said unto them;

and they made ready the passover.

ST. MARK and ST. LUKE are much more explicit than ST. MATTHEW in relating our LORD's directions to the two disciples whom he sent on this occasion. The incidents that were to happen are told by both in the same words; and both stile the upper-room, where the passover was to be kept, *Ἀνώγειον*; which is an uncommon name, and is found in no other part of the New Testament.

The word PREPARED in v. 15. of ST. MARK is not superfluous. It alludes to the manner of making the room ready for the celebration of the passover: * which was examined in every hole and corner by the light of wax-candles, and cleared from the smallest crumb of leaven with a scrupulous nicety. As the time perhaps was short, that the two disciples might better attend to the other parts of their office, the care of searching the room was providentially superseded, as our LORD intimates by this word. The room into which they would be conducted was not only furnished with necessary accommodations, but PREPARED according to the ritual. And no wonder that ST. MARK from the mouth of ST. PETER, who found it so, relates this circumstance. But the obscurity of it to those who were not versed in Jewish affairs (which probably made some copyists leave out the word PREPARED as a gloss upon the preceding) would induce ST. LUKE to pass it over.

* Ainsworth on Exod. xii. 15.

ST.

ST. MARK in turn omits a particular mentioned by ST. LUKE, that is, the names of the two disciples sent on this errand. This he did, as will be shown in another place, because ST. PETER was one of them.

The variations of the Evangelists carry a plain reason generally with them. Our present inquiry is after the cause of their agreement.

S E C T. V.

Conclusion drawn from the preceding comparisons, and confirmed by some other considerations.

LET me then ask how we are to account for this exact concurrence of the Evangelists in so many places. Shall we impute it to *accident*, or *necessity*, or *divine influence*?

I. §. IT cannot with any show of probability be ascribed to *accident* even in the recital of our LORD's discourses. Let the Evangelists here, if you will, be considered as translators. The rendering of a few periods only into another language will seldom be performed by two persons perfectly alike. Of which take an instance from our common version, in a sentence translated severally from the same words in ST. MARK and ST. LUKE.

Mark xii. 38, 39.

Luke xx. 46.

<i>Which love to go in long clothing,</i>	<i>Which desire to walk in long robes,</i>
<i>and love salutations in the market-places;</i>	<i>and love greetings in the markets;</i>
<i>and the chief seats in the synagogues, and the uppermost rooms at feasts.</i>	<i>and the highest seats in the synagogues, and the chief rooms at feasts.</i>

The two versions of this short and easy sentence have seven variations. The *Hebrew* or *Syriac* in which our LORD spoke his instructions, and the *Greek* in which the Evangelists relate them, were languages of a dissimilar genius, as * JOSEPHUS a judge of both intimates. This increases the improbability, that the translations of different hands from the one into the other should exactly coincide. But indeed the Evangelists did not translate the speeches of CHRIST as from a book lying before them. His discourses were continued; and an abridgement was to be made, or parts selected. And yet whether they give a summary of the whole, or choose out particular passages, there is often a full agreement between them.

The same obtains in the history of his actions. The deeds of piety and works of wonder and beneficence done by him were all important; and every circumstance with which he did them, as bearing the impress and character of divine, was worthy of perpetual memory. We find however a general uniformity of the three first Evangelists in recording the same miracles and actions, and frequently in two of them a description and omission of the very same particulars. In so ample a field they must confine their walk; but it is utterly improbable, that they should so repeatedly and in very critical points tread full in each other's steps by mere *accident*.

2. §. THEY were not compelled to this agreement by a *necessity* arising from the laws of truth. It is evident that our LORD's discourses did not so absolutely confine them: since even one of the most solemn and awful is in some parts variously expressed by them. In the institution of the Eucharist, † what ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK translate, THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, ST. LUKE and ST. PAUL render, THIS CUP IS THE NEW TESTAMENT IN MY BLOOD. What in ST. LUKE is, MY BODY GIVEN FOR YOU,

* Preface to his Antiquities.

† See Matth. xxvi. 28. Mark xiv. 24. Luke xxii. 20. 1 Cor. xi. 25.

is in ST. PAUL, MY BODY BROKEN FOR YOU. What our LORD calls in ST. MATTHEW, MY FATHER'S KINGDOM, he stiles in ST. MARK, THE KINGDOM OF GOD. Now as each of these inspired writers has beyond all doubt faithfully represented the meaning of CHRIST, we see that it might be truly done in different words, or in a different form of the same words.

His sentences also sometimes admitted a difference of arrangement: for the order in which two sentences, or the several members of the same sentence are disposed by ST. MATTHEW, is in several places inverted by ST. MARK.

And with regard to his actions; though the most material parts of whatever they were going to relate must command their attention; yet there was no such superior attraction in one specific number and order of secondary circumstances as could turn their thoughts absolutely and exclusively to them. This is plain from instances of the contrary. One Evangelist is sometimes distinct where another is concise, and describes what the other passes over.

3. §. If the agreement which I speak of was not necessary to the truth, it seems already determined, that it is not to be ascribed to the immediate operation of heaven. The HOLY SPIRIT sanctified their hearts with a lively and powerful sense of spiritual things; enlightned their minds with a just knowledge of the truth; and endued them with wisdom to relate the life of CHRIST in a manner becoming the subject and suited to their several designs. And these gifts, which exalted the natural powers of the mind without destroying them, would produce *verity* and *propriety*, but not *identity* of relation. *This* must have proceeded, if the HOLY SPIRIT was the author of it, from so many special acts of his over-ruling influence. But the scriptural history of Providence instructs us, that heaven interposes miraculously, and grants extraordinary aids so far only as

is.

is necessary. * The Angel, whose light shone round ST. PETER in the prison, who made his chains fall off, and led him through dangers and impediments which human ability could not surmount, suffered him to go on by himself when his own discretion could direct him. And in like manner we may conceive, that THE ILLUMINATING SPIRIT, who took the Evangelists by the hand to conduct them clear of error and into all the truth, left them to the exercise of that habitual wisdom which he had given them, where it was a sufficient guide: as seems the case in the following and similar instances.

ST. MATTHEW, ST. MARK, and † ST. LUKE, call our LORD's figurative speeches PARABLES invariably, even those that come under the common notion of *proverbs*: but ‡ ST. JOHN as constantly styles them PROVERBS, where the appellation of *parables* would be as proper, if we were to distinguish between them.

§ ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE relate the very same particulars of our LORD's Temptation in the wilderness, but do not dispose them in the same order.

In which instances it is surely more adviseable to think, that they were left to their own option, than to suppose them unequally instructed, if there was a superior excellence in either mode of expression and arrangement; or, if both were matter of much indifference, that there was any direction of Heaven when none was requisite.

|| This is consonant to the sentiments of learned and judicious divines and commentators; who without a wish or

* Acts xii. 6—10.

† Consult the original of Luke iv. 23.

‡ See the original of John x. 6.

§ Matth. iv. 1—11. Luke iv. 1—12.

|| Lowth's Vindication of the Divine Authority and Inspiration of the Old and New Testament, 2d Ed. Ch. i. p. 34.

Atterbury's Sermons, Vol. iii. p. 236.

Wall's Critical Notes on the New Testament, on John vi. 19. p. 96.

Twiss's Vindication of St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 43.

Archbp. Secker's Sermons, V. vi. Sermon i. on 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. p. 6.

Witsii Miscellanea Sacra, L. i. C. xxii. §. 19.

Beausobre & L'Enfant, Preface generale, p. 154.

Herbery's Sermons, p. 182. 252. Oxford 1774. The inspiration of Scripture is treated

thought of circumscribing the inspiration of the Evangelists within undue limits, yet hold, that diction and method were in great measure their own.

Again, ST. MATTHEW, ST. MARK, and ST. JOHN, in describing the miracle of feeding the five thousand, mention the GRASS on which the multitude sat down; but ST. LUKE takes no notice of it. Now surely we need not deduce the difference from Heaven, when a sufficient reason of it arises out of a circumstance before observed, that ST. LUKE probably had not seen the miracle done, of which the other relaters, ST. MARK being here but the secretary of St. PETER, were eye-witnesses.

Since therefore it appears, that the Evangelists were left in ordinary cases to their own judgement in the choice of words, circumstances, and method, we are not authorized to resolve a concurrence in these into the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit.

Some have supposed, that detached pieces of the history of CHRIST, written by the Apostles or under their inspection, were extant among the faithful before any one of the Gospels was published; and that these being severally copied into them by the Evangelists occasioned the agreement which we are considering.

But before we acquiesce in this solution of the point in debate, should we not have some little evidence of the real existence of these detached pieces, and indeed some probable assurance that they were written by Apostles, if we are to allow them the dignity of directing not only ST. MARK and ST. LUKE, but ST. MATTHEW?

Now though many had undertaken, as ST. LUKE tells us, to write of the ministry of CHRIST, the writings on this subject

treated in Sermon vii, viii, ix, with great accuracy by this late valuable author; who was as much loved by all who knew him for a pleasing simplicity of manners, as admired for strength and clearness of reasoning.

were

were not unconnected stories but continued narrations [* διηγήσεις] nor were the authors Apostles, but subordinate members of the church, as the same Evangelist plainly intimates. As to the Apostles themselves, † EUSEBIUS informs us, "That of all the disciples of the LORD MATTHEW and JOHN only have left us memoirs of him." It is certainly remarkable, that so many of the chosen witnesses, all of whom were zealous for the glory of their LORD, whom they loved and adored, and whose word they preached throughout the world without dread of danger or remission of labour, should commit nothing to writing concerning his wonderful life and character. Yet, I conceive, a reasonable account may be given of their conduct, which appears to have been wise and provident. They saw it to be of the last importance to mankind, that what was written by them on the subject of CHRIST should be preserved in its original purity; and that therefore it was to be guarded with extreme care and vigilance against all dangers of corruption, till it was of sufficient strength to resist the practices of false friends or insidious foes: which strength, the being circulated and known in all parts of the church, the being read and studied and prized by the whole community would assuredly give it; it being impossible that any change should be made unperceived in a text upon which the eyes of all were intent. But this security of the truth must diminish, if books of the same sort multiplied, and especially if they multiplied apace. The numbers of them would enlarge the frontier to be defended against forgery and fable; and by dividing the attention of the faithful among many objects of equal value would weaken their regard for any in particular, and abate their watchfulness over it. It was therefore not adviseable, not to be wished by those to whom the cause of religion was dearer than the indulgence

* Luke i. i.

† Όμως δ' ἐν ἑξ ἀπάντων των τῷ κυρίῳ μαθητῶν ὑπομνηματα μετῴκιος ἦσαν καὶ ἰωάννης μονοῦ καταλείπειν. Hist Ecclef. lib. iii. c. 24. See Lardner's Credibility, vol. viii. p. 90. Testimonies before St. John's Gospel in Mill.

of curiosity, that Gospels should be set forth by every Apostle in any time of their ministry, and much more in the outset of it. But if for this reason the generality of them abstained from writing on the whole argument, for the same or a stronger reason they would not retail the life of CHRIST by writing it in small portions and separate articles, to be sorted, like the Sibyl's leaves, at the discretion of those who collected them. For by this procedure they had opened a door to the adversary, whom they were so solicitous to exclude. The example might have encouraged rash or designing men to compose false anecdotes concerning CHRIST, or to adulterate the true; and to disperse them in the names of the Apostles. And in a variety of small and scattered compositions, how could these have taken cognizance, or the simple and unlearned been aware of the deceit?

However * it was expedient for many reasons that a written history of CHRIST should appear without much delay after his Ascension. The Apostles therefore, as their great caution and reserve lead us to infer, determined, that one of their body, and for the present one only, should undertake and publish such a work; a work appealing to a multitude of living witnesses for many of its facts, and attested by the chosen witnesses in all its parts; and therefore fit to be recommended to their followers and converts as a standard of truth, by which the credibility of other relations might be examined and proved. This it was easy to preserve from interpolations or corruptions; since copies of it, taken by believers or for their use, might be verified by the original remaining with the central church in *Jerusalem*. And for the sake of a like advantage, I apprehend the other Gospels were afterwards published in cities of great resort, and in which Christian churches, the depositories of the authentic manuscripts, were well established.

Now if such was the plan laid down and pursued by the

* See the next Section.

Apostles, till the enlargement of the church required some little variation of measures, it is evident ST. MATTHEW's must have been the Gospel composed in consequence of that plan. And then he might be the first writer of all our LORD's disciples and followers. I believe him to have been so; but for the present wave the argument from the early publication of his Gospel, and returning to the inference which I esteem justly made, that these detached portions of history, if they existed before his Gospel, came not from the hands of the Apostles, I ask, Whether he could have any inducement to make use of them? A member of the apostolical college wanted no information from without on the subject of CHRIST's ministry: and it might weaken but could not confirm the authority of his book, if it appeared, that he had made collections here and there, and transcribed from authors less acquainted than he with the works and doctrine of his LORD, and less honoured with his confidence. The whole tenor of his Gospel, peculiar yet uniform in stile and manner, refutes the idea of such a compilation.

The question then is reduced to ST. MARK, and ST. LUKE. They might copy these detached pieces, though ST. MATTHEW did not. And if they did so, it must follow, that the frequent, and in some instances remarkable coincidence of their narrative with his was entirely casual. But this, I trust, hath been shown to be highly improbable; nor is it indeed consistent with the scheme before us, which by proposing its reason for this coincidence disclaims the vague notion of chance.

The agreement in question then having no other assignable cause, that I perceive, than THAT THE FOLLOWING EVANGELISTS HAD SEEN THE FORMER GOSPELS, I must abide by this.

And to strengthen the conclusion to which I am led, I will subjoin a few examples of a concurrence, not in language and circumstances, but of another kind, which is sometimes found in the Gospels, and seems to lie totally beyond the reach of the

the just mentioned hypothesis, and that is, a consent of two Evangelists in an order of history which is not governed by the course of the events.

The first of these examples will show, that ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK have stopt exactly in the same place, to return to a transaction which they passed by, at the time when it happened; as will appear on comparing them with ST. JOHN. The relation of ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK is so very nearly the same, that it will be sufficient to cite ST. MARK'S.

Mark xiv. 1—10. See Matth. xxvi. 1—14.

5. §. *After TWO DAYS was the feast of the Passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put him to death.*

But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uprore of the people.

And being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious, and she brake the box, and poured it on his head.

And there were some that had indignation within themselves, and said, Why was this waste of the ointment made?

For it might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and given to the poor. And they murmured against her.

And JESUS said, Let her alone, why trouble ye her? She hath wrought a good work on me.

For ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good: but me ye have not always.

She hath done what she could: she is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying.

Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.

And Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went unto the chief priests to betray him unto them.

John, Ch. xii. 1—8.

Then Jesus, SIX DAYS before the passover, came to Bethany where Lazarus was, which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead.

There they made him a supper, and Martha served: but Lazarus was one of them that sat at the table with him.

Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment.

Then said one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, which should betray him,

Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?

This he said, not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein.

Then said Jesus, Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this.

For the poor always ye have with you: but me ye have not always.

Some seeming differences between this account and the preceding have made it a question, Whether they relate to the same action? But the woman described by ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK did more than pour the ointment on the head of CHRIST, as he himself testifies, *She is come aforehand TO ANOINT MY BODY to the burying.* MARY also did more than anoint and wipe the feet of JESUS with her hair, as ST. JOHN intimates where he says, *It was that MARY which ANOINTED THE LORD, and wiped his feet with her hair.* xi. 2. For this parenthesis I take to be designed as a connection of his account with that of the other Evangelist, and to mean, that MARY
anointed

anointed the body as well as the feet of our LORD. The Evangelists on each side relate, that this happened in Bethany, they call the precious ointment by the name of *spikenard*, and rate the value of it at *three hundred pence*. They mention the same murmurs at the supposed waste of it, and the same reply of CHRIST, with regard to the poor, and the prophetic construction of the woman's action. It is not at all likely, that so many the same circumstances should concur on two different occasions; but very likely, that ST. JOHN should tell different circumstances of the same thing, (it being his common practice, to supply the omissions of the other Evangelists, and repeat but so much as is necessary of their relation) and since they had spoken only of the more usual honour of anointing the head, that he should take notice of the less customary honour of anointing the feet, which strongly marked the devout and humble affection of the doer; and that he should take notice of this singly; * as he plainly intended his Gospel to be read in conjunction with the others.

MARY therefore is the woman meant by the two former Evangelists. But since the supper at which our LORD was anointed by her was six days before the passover, whence is it, that ST. MATTHEW brings us within two days of it, and then takes us back to this story? These reasons appear on the face of the narration. *First*, He would not interrupt the account of our LORD's progress from *Jericho* and entrance into *Jerusalem*. *Secondly*, He would give one view of the history of JUDAS; the several parts of which, his death excepted, are thus brought almost close together. † He chiefly, perhaps he solely, had

* See Discourse vii. Though commentators and harmonists are divided on this question, they, who hold the side which is here maintained, are not few nor inconsiderable. See Lucas Brugensis in Quatuor Evangelia; Beza, Grotius, Erasmus Schmidius, on Matth. xxvi. 6. Hammond on Luke vii. 37. Toinard and Doddridge in their Harmonies.

† Possibly it may be thought, that St. Matthew must mean more than Judas, because he says, *When his disciples saw it they had indignation*. But he speaks in the same general way, of king Herod, ii. 20. *They are dead which sought the young child's life*; of the thief on the cross who upbraided our Saviour, xxvii. 44. and on other occasions.

indignation

indignation at MARY's costly devotion. Four days after which and two before the Jewish passover he made his infamous bargain with the rulers. And at this time, the incident, which had exasperated him and which helped to drive him to such an act of perfidy, is mentioned by ST. MATTHEW. *Thirdly*, and especially, he was now entering on the events, to which the anointing made by MARY and our LORD's comment upon it had an immediate reference.

But if these reasons influenced ST. MATTHEW, it is not easily admissible, that they had of themselves, and abstractedly considered, the very same effect on ST. MARK, and led him to introduce the story at the same juncture of time, and place it among the same particulars above and below.

6. §. * ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE describe the driving of the buyers and the sellers out of the temple, as if it had been done by our LORD on the first day of his public entry into *Jerusalem*. Yet it is evident from ST. MARK, that it did not happen till the day after.

7. §. THE restoring of the daughter of JAIRUS to life is disposed later in † ST. MARK's Gospel than in ST. MATTHEW's. Yet ST. MATTHEW has so united the coming of JAIRUS to CHRIST with the entertainment and discourse at his own house, that they cannot be parted without doing great violence to his text, as the attempts of TOINARD and LE CLERC evince. It is much more natural to suppose that *he* here followed the course of things, and that ST. MARK preferred affinity of subject to order of time. It was matter of offence to the Pharisees, that CHRIST conversed with publicans and sinners at MATTHEW's house, and did not bind his disciples to the rigour of their fasts. ST. MARK having mentioned their objections, and our LORD's answers to them, goes on with

* Matth. xxi. 12. Luke xix. 45. Compare Mark xi. 11. 15.

† Mark v. 22. Matth. ix. 18.

this subject, and subjoins other instances of a similar nature. But in pursuing this object he passed the time at which JAIRUS presented himself to CHRIST. He stays therefore till the course of events brought him back to the place where JAIRUS lived, before he relates the miracle wrought at his house. * ST. LUKE accords with ST. MARK: and this miracle occupies precisely the same place in both their Gospels.

8. §. NEED I apologize for maintaining, that the Evangelists have not adhered to the order of time minutely and scrupulously in all things? This is no imperfection in their works. At least the great biographers of antiquity thought it sufficient to give a regular series of the principal events, and introduced others, not as annalists, but with a freer and what they deemed an apter connection.

Some of the learned have been pleased to suppose, that the facts in ST. MATTHEW's Gospel, from Chap. iv. 22. to Chap. xiv. 13. are not now as he placed them, but have been thrown into confusion by some accident. Without taking shelter under Sir ISAAC NEWTON's authority, who declares, † that MATTHEW *tells all things in due order of time*, I will be bold to affirm, that the present order, whether exactly chronological or not, hath an excellence which would be much injured by changing it.

But when the disposition of facts in history is not according to their real succession, but proceeds from the ideas of a more convenient or striking arrangement which the relater frames to himself; there is a strong presumption, if two authors have the very same disposition, that one of them took it from the other.

I might add other instances of consent in the Gospels, of which it is hard to assign a cause otherwise than by supposing, that the later Evangelists chose to follow the foregoing. But as I judge the question sufficiently proved, I forbear.

* Luke viii. 41.

† Observations on Daniel's Prophecies, p. 152.

9. §. MR. JONES, * who has ably shown, that ST. MARK was not an epitomizer of ST. MATTHEW, in his zeal to strengthen his argument † espouses the opinion of Mr. DODWELL and Monf. LE CLERC, that neither of these Evangelists had seen the Gospel of the other: ‡ in proof of which he brings ten instances of such difference between them as he thinks could not otherwise have happened. One is, that ST. MATTHEW, viii. 28. speaks of *two* demoniacs healed where ST. MARK, v. i. mentions only *one*: the reason of which will be shown in § a subsequent part of these discourses. Another, that they disagree in the name of the place where this miracle was performed, ST. MATTHEW calling it the country of the *Gergesenes*, ST. MARK of the *Gadarenes*. This is a small difficulty indeed. If *Gergesa* was subordinate to *Gadara* the metropolis of *Peræa*, as || CELLARIUS and RELAND judge, and ST. MARK did not write in *Judea*, what wonder that he chose the more general name which was best known in the world? But CELLARIUS from EUSEBIUS takes notice, that some esteemed *Gergasi* (so EUSEBIUS writes it) and *Gadara* two names of the same city; and this he thinks was the sentiment of the Syriac translator. To this Sir RICHARD ELLIS most inclines in his *Fortuita Sacra*, p. 29.

If this is granted, it may be admitted among the evidences, that the Greek of ST. MATTHEW'S Gospel is original. If *Gergesa* was *Gadara*, he himself might like to retain an ancient name understood by his countrymen. But a translator would probably have followed ST. MARK, and rendered it *Gadara*. As *Argentina* of an Italian author in a French or English version will be *Straßburg*.

Another of Mr. JONES'S instances is, that ST. MATTHEW relates the words of CHRIST to ST. PETER, *Before the cock*

* Vindication of St. Matthew's Gospel, Ch. vi—ix.

† Ib. p. 86.

‡ Ib. p. 79.

§ See Disc. v. Sect. iii. §. 2.

|| Cellarius Geograph. V. i. B. ii. C. xiii. p. 646. Reland Palæstin. V. ii. p. 774.

crow, thou shalt deny me thrice; ST. MARK, *Before the cock crow TWICE, thou shalt deny me thrice*. A learned note of GROTIUS on MATTH. xxvi. 34. sets this matter in a clear light.

The remaining differences are not harder to solve than these; and Mr. JONES allows them to have been all happily reconciled; they cannot therefore be opposed to such clear proof as hath been produced: perhaps if properly considered they help to confirm it. For if two authors writing on one subject discover each a peculiarity of stile and manner, and yet have whole passages in the same words, the presumption increases, that in the concurring paragraphs one of them had his eye upon the other.

10. §. A LEARNED Father, who had carefully examined and compared the Evangelists and wrote a treatise to show their mutual agreement, gives his judgement, that in their order they were acquainted with the former Gospels, and did not think it unbecoming them to adopt sometimes what had been written by another under the influence of that spirit who guided them all. This was the sentiment of * ST. AUGUSTIN; and I hope no religious person will be offended at the pains which I have taken to evince the justness of it, or think that it derogates from the credit and honour of the Evangelists; whose cause can never be injured by the truth.

* Quamvis singuli [Evangelistæ] suum quendam narrandi ordinem tenuisse videantur, non tamen unusquisque eorum velut alterius præcedentis ignarus voluisse scribere reperitur, vel ignorata prætermisisse, quæ scripsisse alius invenitur: sed sicut cuique inspiratum est, non superfluum Co-operationem sui laboris adjunxit. AUGUSTIN. *De Consensu Evangelistarum*. L. i.

S E C T. VI.

Principles of determining the order of the Evangelists on the ground of the preceding conclusion.

IT being then morally certain, that each foregoing Gospel was known to the following Evangelists, let us on this ground inquire, *Whether the Gospels compared with each other bear any relative marks of the order in which they were published?* And they appear to have many such, especially if the following positions are just.

- I. The Gospel, by which the expressions of another Gospel are explained and rendered either clearer in themselves or to the converted Gentiles, was the later Gospel.
- II. The Gospel, in which the doctrine taught in another is adapted to a more enlarged state of the church, was the later Gospel.
- III. A Gospel published among the *Gentiles* was later than that which was published among the *Jews*.

The two first of these positions may be admitted, I think, without much difficulty: for it must be supposed, that an Evangelist, writing with another Gospel before him and relating the same fact, would not fall short of it in clearness, but would rather explain words or things that were abstruse to a part of his readers; and when the faith had passed the limits of the Jewish church, and was spread among the Gentiles, would abstract the evangelical doctrine, where the case admitted, from its reference to one people, and give it that extent and comprehension, which the divine author of it ultimately intended.

The third position is founded on the propriety and expediency, that a Gospel should be first and early published at *Jerusalem*.

I. It

I. It had been repeatedly promised to the house of ISRAEL, that * out of *Sion* should go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from *Jerusalem*. Which Divine Promise received a more compleat accomplishment, and the house of ISRAEL had the preeminence in every thing relating to the kingdom of God; if the law or word, *written* as well as *preached*, first went forth from *Sion* to all other churches, as from a mother to the daughters.

II. † At the giving of the law from mount *Sinai* there was an oral promulgation of the commandments, and they were written in two tables of stone.

III. The method of joining oral and written notifications of the same things appears to have been judged by the Apostles the furest method: ‡ for thus they acted, when they issued their decree concerning rites to be observed by the converted Gentiles. It was sent to *Antioch* by message and in writing. And if they were so careful, that their own decree should be justly evidenced and published, we cannot suppose them less solicitous, that the life and doctrine of their blessed LORD should be proposed to believers in as ample and satisfactory a manner.

IV. § Myriads of *Jews* who had embraced the faith were yet zealous of the law. And it is well if expectations of a temporal kingdom, and an inveterate confidence in rites and ceremonies did not still operate on the minds of the multitude, and require *line on line, precept on precept*, to teach them the spiritual nature of CHRIST's kingdom, and that it demanded internal and universal obedience. These truths were indeed inculcated by the preaching of the Apostles; || but if their followers were to read MOSES AND THE PROPHETS in their houses, it was fit that they should have opportunity of studying the law of CHRIST in the same manner.

* Isa. ii. 3. Michah. iv. 2.

† Exod. xx. 1. xxxi. 18.

‡ Acts xv. 23—27.

§ Acts xxi. 20.

|| Deut. vi. 6—9.

V. But a great number of them could seldom hear the instructions of the Apostles, who according to ancient and constant tradition resided wholly in *Judea* for several years after the Ascension. And though the Gospel was at first preached only to the *Jews*, it was not limited to *Judea*, but spread beyond it. Many converts were made, of those who came to *Jerusalem* only on solemn occasions, and for the rest of the year lived in other countries far distant from it. These converts must naturally desire to carry home with them a written Gospel for their own sake and for the promotion of the faith.

A written Gospel would enable them to know the certainty of those things wherein they had been instructed by the Apostles, and to comprehend the several parts of a new dispensation much better than if they trusted to memory alone. It would fortify their minds against errors and prejudices early received by themselves, and zealously espoused by their countrymen. It would establish their faith, animate their hopes, and yield them that comfort and delight, which pious minds feel in meditating and reading the life and doctrine of CHRIST.

It would serve as a criterion, by which they could prove and examine what was advanced by those who appeared among them as preachers of the Gospel, whether it were according to the analogy of the faith, and the teaching of the Apostles.

It would add weight and power to their endeavours for the conversion of others in their several places of abode. For however perfectly they might be informed of facts and instructed in doctrines, they wanted that authority to teach others, which the gift of inspiration derived on the Apostles. But this would be in great measure supplied to them by a Gospel composed and approved at *Jerusalem*; which in the very circumstances of its publication carried with it the testimony of the Apostles, and bore, as it were, the seal of the whole sacred college to its truth.

VI. If therefore we consider the great advantages accruing to the believers in *Judea*, and the still greater to those of the dispersion

dispersion by a written Gospel, we cannot suppose, that the pastoral care of the Apostles permitted their flock to remain long without one.

VII. It was for the honour of the Gospel, that it should be quickly notified by every mode of publication to the *Jews* in general, to convince them that it did not withdraw itself from the inquiry of its contemporaries, but proposed the facts on which it was founded to be examined and scrutinized by those among whom they were done.

VIII. It was a great act of charity to the Jewish nation to warn them early of the peril of rejecting the Gospel: and a written account of it might gain access to many, who stopt their ears against the preaching of the Apostles.

IX. When the great persecution of the church in *Jerusalem* began with the stoning of ST. STEPHEN, all the chief members of it were dispersed, except the Apostles; who kept indeed their station, but, the popular tide turning against them, could not be heard in public so attentively as before; and then it became especially requisite to obviate the various aspersions and false reports of their adversaries, by publishing a plain memorial of what CHRIST had done and taught, and what the witnesses of his life and doctrine taught in his name.

X. It would also * prevent some cavils of the Jews, encourage the conversion of the Gentiles, and when they were converted assure their minds and confirm their faith, if the predictions of CHRIST concerning their admission into the church, and his command to his Apostles *to teach and baptize all nations* appeared on record, before the word was preached among them. But to answer such ends, it was necessary, that these things should be early written and divulged, that the knowledge of them might anticipate an event which was hastening forward.

It may be added as a corollary to these observations, that a

* See Disc. iv. Sect. v. §. 17.

Gospel designed to be of the most extensive benefit to the people of the Jews, must have been written in a language which was most generally understood by them. If therefore it was published in *Hebrew*, as the Fathers testify, for the sake of the common people of *Jerusalem* and *Judea*; at the same time or very soon after it must have been published also in *Greek*, which was more familiar than *Hebrew* to a great body of the Dispersion.

DISCOURSE THE FOURTH.

ON ST. MATTHEW.

S E C T. I.

ST. MATTHEW *wrote before* ST. MARK.

FROM these positions it will follow, that ST. MATTHEW, was the earliest writer of a Gospel. But in deducing this consequence it must be assumed just for the present, that he wrote for the Jews and in *Judea*; and this being granted, whatever proves ST. MARK and ST. LUKE to have written in other countries is a proof of his priority to them: of which sort is the first argument here alleged in comparing him with ST. MARK.

I. §. Matth. iii. 6.

And were baptized of him
in Jordan.

Mark i. 5.

And were baptized of him
in THE RIVER OF Jordan.

The addition of the word RIVER in ST. MARK may seem a slight circumstance on which to found an argument; and yet I think it affords a strong probability, that ST. MARK wrote at a distance from *Judea*, and not so near it as *Egypt*: for I much question whether this is not the only place, either in the Bible or Apocrypha, where this river is called any more than simply JORDAN. * So famous was it in *Palestine*, and the countries

* Dr. Shaw, Travels, p. 373. says, "The *Jordan*, excepting the *Nile*, is by far the most considerable river that I have seen either in the *Levant* or *Barbary*.

round,

round, and among these * in *Egypt*. But at *Rome* it was a name little known, except among the learned, till after the wars of TITUS VESPASIAN, and the trophies erected on the conquest of *Judea*. And since *to be baptized in Jordan*, like ST. JOHN's expression, † JOHN also *was baptizing in Enon*, does not of itself determine, whether a river or a place were intended, one would be apt to suspect, that a question of this kind had been asked, and gave occasion to the inserting of the word *river*. Else it was extremely natural for ST. MARK to speak of *Jordan*, as all the other sacred writers have done.

2. §. Matth. ix. 14.

Mark ii. 18.

AND THE DISCIPLES OF
JOHN AND OF THE PHARI-
SEES USED TO FAST.

*Then came the disciples of John
saying,*

*Why do we and the Pharisees
fast oft, but thy disciples fast
not?*

*And they come to him and say
unto him,*

*Why do the disciples of John
and of the Pharisees fast, but
thy disciples fast not?*

Here a little explanation is premised, but the next instance is more striking.

3. §. Matth. xv. 1, 2.

Mark vii. 1—5.

*Then came to JESUS
Scribes and Pharisees*

which were of Jerusalem,

*Then came together unto him
the Pharisees and certain of the
Scribes*

which came from Jerusalem.

*And when they saw some of
his disciples eat with defiled
(THAT IS TO SAY, WITH*

* See Eccclus. xxiv. 26.

† John iii. 23.

UNWASHEN)

DISCOURSE IV. SECT. I. 81

UNWASHEN) *hands, they found fault.*

FOR THE PHARISEES AND ALL THE JEWS, EXCEPT THEY WASH THEIR HANDS OFT, EAT NOT, HOLDING THE TRADITION OF THE ELDERS.

AND WHEN THEY COME FROM THE MARKET, EXCEPT THEY WASH THEY EAT NOT. AND MANY OTHER THINGS THERE BE, WHICH THEY HAVE RECEIVED TO HOLD, AS THE WASHING OF CUPS AND POTS, AND OF BRAZEN VESSELS AND TABLES.

Then the Pharisees and Scribes asked him,

saying,

Why do thy disciples transgress

the tradition of the elders.

Why walk not thy disciples according

to the tradition of the elders?

ST. MARK's narration goes hand in hand with ST. MATTHEW's for a good way together, both in the preceding and subsequent parts; except that he has inserted this note for the sake of those who were strangers to Jewish customs; of which there is no such explication in all ST. MATTHEW's Gospel, because they for whom he composed it did not want any.

We meet with another little note concerning *Judea* in the xi. chapter of ST. MARK, v. 13. where giving an account of the barren fig-tree he says, *For the time of figs was not yet.* ST. MATTHEW does not make this observation, as every one who lived in that country must know, that the full season of ripe

L

figs

figs was not till some time after the latest passover. Compare Matth. xxi. 19.

4. §. Matth. xv. 22.

Mark vii. 26.

And behold a CANAANITISH woman came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him.

The woman was a GREEK, a SYRO-PHOENICIAN by nation, and she besought him.

Phœnicia was part of ancient *Canaan*; but the latter name was grown into disuse. It is mentioned no where in the New Testament, except here, and Acts vii. 11. xiii. 19. where ST. STEPHEN and ST. PAUL speak of remote antiquity, and speak of it to a Jewish audience. JOSEPHUS uses it only with regard to the same higher ages. ST. MARK therefore explains *Canaanitish* by * *Syro-phœnician*, which was more generally understood. By saying, that, the woman was a *Greek*, he means that she was not of the Jewish religion.

As the term *Canaanite* was become obsolete, may we not conclude, that a translator of ST. MATTHEW from the Hebrew would have rendered it either *Syro-phœnician* with ST. MARK, or simply *Phœnician*, † as is often done in the Septuagint? This therefore is one of the presumptive proofs, that the Greek of this Gospel is from the hand of the author himself. And the preference of an antique to a modern word in this place makes the conjecture ‡ already mentioned more probable, that *Gergesa* and *Gadara* were names of the same city, of which ST. MATTHEW chose the more ancient.

* The Syro-phœnicians were so called to distinguish them from the Phœnicians of Africa, who were Lybo-phœnicians. Both were of the same stock, and had borne the name of Canaanites; which was still remaining in Africa, when St. Augustin lived; for he tells us, that the country people about Hippo being asked, Who they were, answered in the Punic tongue, that they were Canaanites. Lib. Expositionum Epist. ad Romanos. See Grotius on Matth. xv. 22.

† Grotius ib. This excellent annotator on the Gospels begins a note on Matthew xxviii. 1. with an observation which is verified in the instance before us. Marcus ita Matthæi legit vestigia, ut sæpe ei præset interpretis vicem.

‡ Disc. iii. Sect. v. §. 9.

5. §. Matth.

5. §. Matth. xviii. 8, 9.

Mark ix. 43—48.

8. *Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet, to be cast into everlasting fire.*

43. *And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off. It is better for thee*

to enter into LIFE maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the unquenchable fire.

44. *Where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.*

45. *And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into LIFE, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the unquenchable fire.*

46. *Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.*

9. *And if thine eye offend thee, pluck*

it out, and cast it from thee: it is better for thee to enter into LIFE

with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire.

47. *And if thine eye offend thee, pluck*

it out:

it is better for thee to enter into THE KINGDOM OF GOD

with one eye, than having two eyes, to be cast into hell-fire:

48. *Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.*

GEHENNA, the name for hell in the original of both Evangelists, was a name purely Jewish, and unknown to the Gentiles. ST. MARK therefore has given the passage more at large, the only one in which GEHENNA occurs in his Gospel: by which means he has shown, as by a paraphrase, what ideas were annexed to the word, and in what sense our LORD used it. In verse 47, he says, *It is better for thee TO ENTER INTO THE*

KINGDOM OF GOD *with one eye, &c.* Where ENTRING INTO THE KINGDOM GOD being synonymous to ENTRING INTO LIFE in the preceding verses, the spiritual acceptation of the word LIFE was explained to those who were not much accustomed to this notion of it.

6. §. Matth. xix. 1.

Mark x. 1.

When Jesus had finished these sayings, he departed from Galilee, and came into the coasts of Judea BEYOND Jordan. *And he arose from thence and cometh into the coasts of Judea* BY THE FARTHER SIDE OF Jordan.

The meaning of both Evangelists is the same, * that our LORD in travelling from *Galilee* to *Judea* passed through the country beyond *Jordan* which was called *Perea*. But ST. MARK by a little addition, still less in the original and nearer to ST. MATTHEW's text than it appears in the version, has rendered the sense less dubious. ST. MATTHEW says, Πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, St. Mark, Διὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

With the same ease he has avoided another little ambiguity of ST. MATTHEW; who in relating the surmise at HEROD's court, that JESUS was JOHN the Baptist revived, thus expresses it, Ch. xiv. 2. *This is John the Baptist* [Ἐγέρθη ἀπο τῶν νεκρῶν] *he is risen from the dead.* Our translation gives the true, and indeed obvious, sense of the words. † But since they are capable of another, *He is raised up by the dead*; as if they had caused him to rise again, ST. MARK has changed ST. MATTHEW's preposition for one not so liable to this misconstruction [Ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγέρθη. vi. 14.]

* That Πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου means, not *beside* but *beyond* Jordan, See Lightfoot on John i. 28. V. i. p. 527. Fol. The construction of the sentence is, Ἰδοὺ πέραν, or, διὰ τοῦ πέραν, τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας. Our Saviour, who had preached in the several tribes of Israel on this side Jordan, proceeded now to preach to that part of them who dwelt beyond it, before he suffered.

† See Wettstein on Matth. xiv. 2. whose observation this is: and compare Mark viii. 31.

I shall

I shall here mention a third emendation, no greater than these, and no less proper. ST. MATTHEW, Ch. xxii. 30. says, * *But are as the Angels of GOD IN HEAVEN*; where it being doubtful, whether IN HEAVEN is to be referred to GOD or the Angels, ST. MARK has made it clear by saying, xii. 25. *But are as the Angels WHO ARE IN HEAVEN.*

I think we may conclude from these small improvements, on the text of ST. MATTHEW, that he had published his Gospel in Greek before ST. MARK's appeared. For if we put the contrary case, we must suppose what is very improbable, that he or his translator has followed ST. MARK's language in many instances, and yet deserted it in these, which are accuracies merely grammatical, and would have made no alteration of his sense.

7. §. We read in ST. MATTHEW, that on the morning of the Resurrection, an Angel first and then CHRIST himself appearing to the women who went early to visit the sepulchre, sent a message by them to the disciples, "That they should go into Galilee and assemble together at a certain mountain, and that there he would show himself to them:" the sequel of which is thus told by the same Evangelist. xxviii. 16. *Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee into a mountain which Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him they worshipped him.*

ST. MARK relates the message nearly in the words of ST.

* This instance shows, that Matth. i. 11. will bear the sense in which Mr. BOWYER would understand it [Conjectures, p. 3.] without any change of the text. "Josiah begat Jechoniah, and the brethren of Jechoniah that were at the time of the Captivity." To establish which sense he would read the passage thus, *Kai τοὺς ἀδελφούς αὐτοῦ Τόβη ἐν τῇ μετοικεσίᾳ.* The article Τόβη, which he supposes to have been lost, may have been, as is in this place, originally omitted.

The Jechoniah, who is mentioned in the next verse as begetting Salathiel after the Captivity, was probably, as St. Jerom supposes, the son of the former, and the same as is intitled Assir, 1 Chron. iii. 17. which might be a name given him from his circumstances, as The Prisoner, or, Captive; and he might be emphatically so stiled on account of his preeminence over the rest of the Captivity, and recorded by this name rather than that of Jechoniah to distinguish him from his father. And thus each series of the three has fourteen persons.

MATTHEW:

MATTHEW: *But go your way tell his disciples, and Peter, that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him.* xvi. 7.

But the success of this message he does not mention. And yet if brevity confined an historian to relate only one of them, would he not naturally prefer the fact as more important without the promise, than the promise without the subsequent completion? To what then shall we ascribe the choice made by ST. MARK?

The manifestation of CHRIST on the mountain of *Galilee* to the Apostles, * and a numerous assembly of other believers must have been of great fame and notoriety not only in the church but throughout *Palestine*, and had the advantage of being † predicted and promised before the death of CHRIST as well as after his Resurrection. No wonder therefore that the first Evangelist, the Evangelist of the Jews, fixed his eye upon it, and desiring to bring the prophecy and accomplishment into one view, passed over the intermediate visits of our LORD to his Apostles, and hastened on to this.

But this rendered it proper for the next Evangelist, limited by the conciseness of his plan, to omit what was already described; and, since the performance of CHRIST'S promise to the disciples, *that they should see him in Galilee*, would be assured by the reality of other appearances, to recite some of these, which though less celebrated were equally convincing. This track ST. MARK has taken, as knowing that ST. MATTHEW had gone before in another.

I need not here dwell longer on this argument; because, first, The precedence of ST. MATTHEW to ST. MARK is hardly a questionable point; and secondly, If it might still be disputed, other evidences of it will arise in the two following sections.

* 1 Cor. xv. 6.

† Matth. xxvi. 32.

S E C T. II.

ST. MATTHEW wrote before ST. LUKE.

IF we next compare ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE, I think the following examples will evince the priority of ST. MATTHEW.

1. §. Matth. iii. 3.

*For this is he that was spoken
of by the prophet Esaias,
saying,*

*Prepare ye the way of the
LORD,
make his paths straight.*

Luke iii. 4—6.

*As it is written in the book of
the words of Esaias the prophet,
saying,*

*The voice of one crying in the
wilderness,*

*Prepare ye the way of the
LORD,
make his paths straight.*

*Every valley shall be filled, and
every mountain and hill shall be
brought low: and the crooked
shall be made straight, and the
rough ways shall be made smooth;
AND ALL FLESH SHALL SEE
THE SALVATION OF GOD.*

ST. LUKE, who a little before had told us in the words of
* SIMEON, that CHRIST is *a light to lighten the Gentiles*, here
gives us the same assurance on the authority of a greater pro-
phet, that "*All flesh shall see the salvation of God.*" He seems
therefore to have lengthened out ST. MATTHEW's quotation
for two reasons; first, † Because he wrote for those who were

* Ch. ii. 32.

† Judæis Veteris Testamenti leges historię et prophetię, quantum ad literalem
sensum, notę erant, ita ut digito eas tantum monstrasse satis erat, sed gentibus non
item. Surenhusii *Kritik*, p. 290.

88 DISCOURSE IV. SECT. II.

less acquainted with the prophecy; and *secondly*, Because the part, which he has added, contains a promise, that * “ The manifestation which GOD will make of himself by the Gospel will be such a blessing as all nations will have a share in.”

2. §. Matth. xi. 11.

Luke vii. 28.

Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist.

Among them that are born of women there is not a greater PROPHEET than John the Baptist.

The Gentiles being little acquainted with the character and office of JOHN, whose mission had been confined to his own country, ST. LUKE very usefully inserted the word *prophet*, that it might appear more evident, in what respect JOHN was to be numbered among the greatest of those that are born of women.

It follows immediately in both Evangelists ;

3. §. Matth.

Luke.

But he that is least in the kingdom of HEAVEN is greater than he.

But he that is least in the kingdom of GOD is greater than he.

The kingdom of HEAVEN and the kingdom of GOD are the same thing : for heaven is as it were the palace and † throne of the Divine Majesty, ‡ and is therefore not unfrequently put for GOD himself. But though the terms were synonymous, there might be an expediency in using the one or the other, according to the apprehensions of the readers to whom the Evangelists addressed themselves.

* *Lowth* on Isai. xl. 5.

† Isai. lxvi. 1. Matth. xxiii. 22.

‡ *Grotius* on Matth. iii. 2. Compare Dan. iv. 26. Matth. xxi. 25. Luke xv. 21. Macc. iii. 18.

The

The Jews expected a kingdom to be set up in the days of the MESSIAH, but were prepossessed with such gross conceptions of it, as might render it less proper to announce it to them under the title of *kingdom of God*: since according to an idiom of their scriptural language, earthly things which are great and striking in their kind are said to be of God; as * great mountains are *mountains of God*; † goodly cedars are *cedars of God*; ‡ an exceeding great city is *a city of God*. And thus the *kingdom of God* might convey no higher idea to their carnal minds than that of a mighty empire, an empire to be raised indeed by the hand and providence of God, but to be founded on temporal victories, and distinguished by extent of earthly dominion and power. ST. MATTHEW therefore generally calls it *The kingdom of HEAVEN*: which title referred them to § a prophecy of DANIEL concerning it, and at the same time had an aptitude to raise their thoughts from carnal to spiritual, from earthly to heavenly things, and to carry their views from the present transitory scene to future and permanent glories. He does indeed a few times speak of the *kingdom of God*; but it is || in places sufficiently guarded by the context, and which clearly show the spirituality of this kingdom.

But ST. MARK and ST. LUKE say constantly, *The kingdom of God*, and in no one instance call it the *kingdom of HEAVEN*. ST. LUKE declines the use of another expression frequently found in ST. MATTHEW. Once he has *Heavenly Father* [ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ] as opposed to fathers on earth; *If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him*, xi. 13. But we do not meet with, *Father which is in heaven* [ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς] throughout his Gospel; not even in the Lord's prayer, as it still stands in the

* Psalm xxxvi. 6.

† lxxx. 10.

‡ Jonah iii. 3. See the marginal translation in these places.

§ Dan. ii. 44.

|| vi. 33. xii. 28. xix. 24. xxi. 31. 43.

Vulgate translation, and as it was anciently read by * TERTULLIAN and ORIGEN; the latter of whom takes particular notice, that ST. LUKE has omitted *In heaven*, and says only, FATHER, or, OUR FATHER. The words of CHRIST, which according to ST. MATTHEW are, † *Your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things*, are in ST. LUKE, ‡ *Your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things*. In other passages he substitutes the name of GOD for *Father which is in heaven*; and with some little loss of grace and propriety in the following and perhaps another or two instances;

4. §. Matth. xii. 50.

Luke viii. 21.

For whosoever shall do the will *My mother and my brethren*
of MY FATHER WHICH IS *are these which hear the word*
IN HEAVEN, *the same is my brother and sister and mother.* *of GOD and do it.*

Now the probable reason of this variation of ST. LUKE from ST. MATTHEW is, that he wrote for readers of another sort; for those who were yet unacquainted with the prophecy which foretold the *kingdom of HEAVEN*, and therefore would not be edified by a reference to this prophecy; and might on the other hand be less edified by hearing of the *kingdom of HEAVEN*, than of the *kingdom of GOD*. They had been bred up in the belief of a multiplicity of gods, some of whom had their residence in *heaven*, some in the ocean, and some in Hades. To such persons it was more instructive to say, *The kingdom of GOD*, which gave no countenance to this notion of local divinities, but rather carried with it an idea of unity and omnipresence. And as a proof of ST. LUKE's care to avoid a language that might in the least favour the low conceptions they had en-

* See *Wetstein's* Greek Text. note on Luke xi. 2. Origen *Περὶ ἰνυχῶν*. Ed. *Reading*, p. 94.

† Matth. vi. 32.

‡ Luke xii. 30.

tertaind

tertain'd of the Deity, let me subjoin a short parallel between ST. MATTHEW and him, where we see him, in citing the same sentence, omit the part that seems to ascribe a human form to the ALMIGHTY.

Matth. iv. 4.

It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of GOD.

Luke iv. 4.

It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of GOD.

We readily admit, that such circumspection was not necessary with regard to all the Gentile converts : but if some were slow to part with ancient error, and in danger of mixing it with the truth, it was the spirit of the Gospel to attend to their weakness.

5. §. Matth. xxii. 23—32.

23. *The same day came unto him the Sadducees, which say, that there is no resurrection, and they asked him,*

24. *Saying, Master, Moses SAID, If a man die having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed to his brother.*

25. *Now there were WITH US seven*

brethren ; and the first when he had married a wife, deceased ;

Luke xx. 27—38.

27. *Then came unto him certain of the Sadducees, which deny that there is any resurrection, and they asked him,*

28. *Saying, Master, Moses WROTE UNTO US, If any man's brother die having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed to his brother.*

29. *There were therefore seven*

brethren ; and the first took a wife, and died without children.

Matth. xxii. 23—32.

and having no issue, left his wife unto his brother.

26. *Likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seven,*

27. *And last of all the woman died also.*

28. *Therefore in the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her.*

29. *JESUS answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of GOD.*

30. *For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage;*

but are as the angels of GOD in heaven.

31. *But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was SPOKEN unto you by GOD, saying,*

32. *I am the GOD of Abraham, and the GOD of Isaac, and the GOD of Jacob? GOD*

Luke xx. 27—38.

30. *And the second took her to wife, and he died childless.*

31. *And the third took her; and in like manner the seven also: and they left no children, and died.*

32. *Last of all the woman died also.*

33. *Therefore in the resurrection, whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife.*

34. *And JESUS answering said unto them,*

The children of this world marry and are given in marriage.

35. *But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage.*

36. *NEITHER CAN THEY DIE ANY MORE;*

for they are equal unto the angels: and are the children of GOD, being the children of the resurrection.

37. *Now that the dead are raised, EVEN MOSES SHOWED AT THE BUSH,*

when he calleth the LORD the GOD of Abraham, and the GOD of Isaac, and the GOD of Jacob.

Matth. xxii. 23—32.

is not the GOD of the dead, but of the living.

Luke xx. 27—38.

38. For he is not a GOD of the dead, but of the living: FOR ALL LIVE UNTO HIM.

This conference of CHRIST with the Sadducees being related by the three Evangelists, the variations of ST. MARK and ST. LUKE from ST. MATTHEW offer some observations to the present purpose.

1. They are careful to state the question of the Sadducees in such manner, that the law on which it was grounded, and which ST. MATTHEW mentions in general terms, should be seen to be a national law peculiar to the Jews; MOSES wrote UNTO US.

2. They are as careful not to restrain the resurrection to this people, omitting one particular which the Jews themselves would think requisite to form the case. Seven brethren who were Gentiles might all marry the same woman without danger of a litigation in the future age, as they would never rise again to dispute about her, according to the general sentiments of the Jews who held a resurrection: * for they confined it to the circumcision. The Sadducees therefore, that their question might be circumstanced as the Jews required it to be, said, *There were seven brethren WITH US*, that is, of our nation. So their words stand in ST. MATTHEW. But ST. MARK and ST. LUKE leave out this restriction, WITH US, that the question being general, Gentiles as well as Jews might see, that they were interested in the decision of it.

3. ST. MATTHEW leaving the immortality of the just to be inferred from their future equality with angels, and this inference not being so clear to the Gentiles, to whom the doctrine of angels was new, ST. LUKE explicitly declares, that THEY CANNOT DIE ANY MORE.

* Pocock, Not. Miscellan. C. vi. V. i. p. 194. Fol. Grot. in Matth. x. 28. Col. 2. Rabbi Bechai—resurrectionem propriam vult esse Israelitarum.

4. He adds another short sentence of our LORD's argument, FOR ALL LIVE UNTO HIM, which not only opposed the error of the Sadducees concerning the soul, but at the same time obviated a popular notion of the pagans, * that death dissolved men's relation to heaven, and that after it they existed wholly under a distinct dominion of other powers.

5. The manner in which he and ST. MARK quote the Old Testament or refer to it, is different from ST. MATTHEW's: who writing to a people well versed in it, introduces the words of it as SPOKEN, often when CHRIST alleges it, but always when he does it himself. † Of which there are a dozen instances.

ST. MARK himself cites it but twice. i. 2. *As it is WRITTEN in the prophets*; and, xv. 28. *And the SCRIPTURE was fulfilled which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.* ST. LUKE's citations are more numerous; and a few examples will show how they are made. The first time he mentions the law of MOSES, it is thus; ii. 22, 23. *According to the law of Moses—As it is WRITTEN in the law of the LORD.* When he first speaks of the prophets, he says, iii. 4. *As it is WRITTEN in the book of the words of ESAIAS the prophet.* He does not himself bring any thing from the Psalms; but he thus expresses our LORD's reference to them; xx. 42. *And DAVID himself saith in the Book of Psalms.* The last time he introduces the mention of Scripture, it is as follows;

xxiv. 44, 45. *And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were WRITTEN in the LAW of MOSES, and in the PROPHETS, and in the PSALMS, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the SCRIPTURES.*

* Nos Juvenem exanimum et nil jam Cælestibus ullis
Debentem vano mœsti comitamur honore. ÆNEID. xi. 51.

† Matth. i. 22. ii. 15. 17. 23. iii. 3. iv. 14. viii. 17. xii. 17. xiii. 35. xxi. 4. xxvii. 9. 35.

Thus

Thus ST. LUKE signifies to the unlearned Gentile, that the Law of MOSES is the written Law of GOD; that the words of the prophets, and Psalms of DAVID are also written; and that the * three titles of *The Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms*, comprehend the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

† An author of note observes, that ST. LUKE does not quote Scripture according to the forms of doing it which were used by the Rabbis and learned Jews, and from hence infers, that he was not conversant in their books. This may have been the case of ST. LUKE, but I conceive the argument by which he would prove it, not to be well founded: for we hardly meet with a form of citing Scripture in any other book of the New Testament, which is not found in the speeches of ST. PETER, ST. STEPHEN, or ST. PAUL, to the Jews, in the Acts of the Apostles. And the mode of citation, to which ST. LUKE adheres in his Gospel, is retained by others, who certainly were well-read in Hebrew literature, as by ST. MARK, and on all proper occasions by ST. PAUL. For ST. PAUL does not mention or allege the Law and Prophets in one and the same manner to Jews and Gentiles. To FELIX the Roman governor he says of himself, Acts xxiv. 14. *Believing all things which are WRITTEN in the Law and the Prophets.* But to king AGRIPPA, ib. xxvi. 22. *Saying none other things than those which the Prophets and Moses DID SAY should come.* And thus he distinguishes in his Epistles. In that to the *Hebrews* are many passages from the Old Testament, but not a single instance in which it is quoted as WRITTEN. But in his other Epistles he rarely uses any other form than, IT IS WRITTEN, or, THE SCRIPTURE SAITH. Thus he cites it to the *Romans*: the chief variations from which mode to that of, HE SAITH, are in the three chapters, ix, x, xi. which principally relate to the Jews. And even there he seldom fails to name the prophet whose words are adduced. To the *Galatians*, and in

* *Whitby* on Luke xxiv. 44.

† *Surenhusius. Катангуя. p. 315.*

both Epistles to the *Corinthians*, with one or two exceptions, he urges the words of the Old Testament as WRITTEN. To the *Philippians*, *Colossians*, and *Thessalonians*, if I mistake not, he makes no direct quotation from it. In the Epistle to the *Ephesians* he refers to it twice, and there indeed in both places under the form of, HE SAITH. * But he himself had spent above two years in teaching them with the utmost diligence and attention; and wrote his Epistle to them some years after; when he might have full assurance that he spoke to those *who knew the Law*. A passage in this Epistle compared with one similar in that to the *Colossians*, seems to prove, that he made a difference between them, and judged the *Ephesians* to be better versed in the sacred books. To these he proposes the precept of obedience to parents with a view to the Mosaic promise; Eph. vi. 1—3. *Children, obey your parents in the LORD; for this is right: HONOUR THY FATHER AND MOTHER; WHICH IS THE FIRST COMMANDMENT WITH PROMISE.* But he omits this reference to the words of the Decalogue, in giving the same precept to the *Colossians*; with whose proficiency in the Scriptures he was less acquainted, as having never been among them. He says only; Col. iii. 20. *Children obey your parents in all things: for this is well pleasing unto the LORD.*

Thus we see that ST. PAUL has one mode of citing the Old Testament to the *Hebrews*, and another to the churches of which the Gentiles were members; that in the former case he agrees with ST. MATTHEW, in the latter with ST. MARK and ST. LUKE. And in this respect there is so much uniformity of the Apostle and two Evangelists, that we may justly conclude, it was not accidental, but designed by him and them, for the same purpose of suiting their stile to the small measure of scriptural knowledge, which they might well suppose many of their readers to possess. By which means the unlearned or new-converted Gentiles were instructed, that what was offered

* Acts xix. 8. and 10.

to them as the word of GOD *which came in old time*, was to be found in the books of Scripture: and if Judaizers crept in and perplexed them with doctrines of an oral or traditionary law, were furnished with this reply to such teachers; "When the
 " Apostles and Evangelists, who have been our more immediate guides, propose to us any part of the Mosaic economy,
 " they allege only what is WRITTEN, and what they carefully
 " inform us to be so."

I have dwelt so long on this subject, not only as it is of weight in the present inquiry, but as it yields us one of those simple notes of authenticity with which the Gospels abound, and which the genius of forgery could never have devised.

6. §. Matth. xxiii. 27.

Luke xi. 44.

Ye are like unto WHITED GRAVES, which appear indeed beautiful outward, but within are full of dead men's bones and all UNCLEANNESS. *Ye are as GRAVES WHICH APPEAR NOT, and the men that walk over them are not aware of them.*

* GROTIUS conceived these similitudes to be different, in which opinion he was not singular, and that, our LORD having used both, ST. MATTHEW took one, and ST. LUKE the other. But † DR. POCOCKE, to whom HAMMOND refers us, hath, I think, by his great skill in Rabbinical learning, cleared up the passage in ST. MATTHEW, and showed, that his *whited graves* are the same thing with ST. LUKE's, *which appear not*.

The Jews esteemed, that a man contracted a legal pollution by touching even the outside of a sepulchre or grave. To guard against which inconvenience, the Sanhedrim at stated times sent out persons to examine the graves that were gone to

* Grot. in Luke xi. 44.

† Pocock. Notæ Miscell. C. v. p. 154. Hammond on Matth. xxiii. 27.

ruin, and by time or accident become scarce distinguishable, and to mark them with lime tempered with water. They did not mark those that were manifest, says MAIMONIDES, but those that were doubtful or concealed. These marks were renewed from time to time; for the weather and growth of grass and herbs would soon efface them.

WHITED GRAVES in ST. MATTHEW therefore mean GRAVES WHICH HAVE BEEN WHITED, *κεκονιαμένοι*, that is, graves which have had these cautionary marks, and have lost them again. For when our LORD says, *They appear beautiful outward*, he means not by the hand of art but of nature, which had again covered the ground with verdure; * for this is the beauty to which he has regard. ST. LUKE therefore calls them *ἄδηλα*, WHICH APPEAR NOT. And this is certainly a plainer language to readers in general; otherwise so many could not have mistaken ST. MATTHEW's meaning, and substituted a quite different idea for it.

† A story related in *the Recognitions* seems to allude to this custom. ST. PETER is introduced as speaking of the sepulchres of two of the brethren, "WHICH WERE VERY YEAR WHITED OF THEIR OWN ACCORD. *By which miracle the fury of many against us was repressed, when they thereby perceived, that our brethren were had in remembrance with GOD.*"

This agrees with the account of MAIMONIDES, and shows, that the whiting of the sepulchres was of no long duration.

The notion of uncleanness annexed to dead bodies adds force and spirit to the similitude, as it stands in ST. MATTHEW; yet ST. LUKE thought fit to drop it, lest the Gentiles should think themselves concerned in it, and like the Jews, whom many of them were too fond of following, should grow more afraid of legal than moral defilement.

* See Matth. vi. 29.

† *Recognitions*, B. i. §. 71. ap. Lardner, V. ii. p. 794.

7. §. Matth. xxiv. 15, 16.

Luke xxi. 20.

When therefore ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whose readeth let him understand)

Then let them which are in Judea flee into the mountains.

When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh.

Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains.

What ST. MATTHEW had delivered in the figurative stile of the prophet DANIEL, ST. LUKE, passing over the reference to this prophecy, more openly declares, *The holy place* is Jerusalem, * and *the abomination of desolation* are the armies encompassing it, and encamping on this *Holy ground* with ensigns of idolatrous worship. When this happened, its desolation was soon to be expected.

8. §. ST. MATTHEW says in the same chapter, v. 29.

Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken.

† This is the symbolical language of prophecy to signify the ruin of great personages and kingdoms, and denotes the same events, which are thus predicted in ST. LUKE;

xxi. 23, 24. *There shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of*

* Grot. on Matth. xxiv. 15. Alex. Merus on v. 28. Hæc illa abominatio desolationis est, quam Στρατόπεδος Lucas interpretatur, planè dicere solitus quæ Matthæus ἰερουσαλὴμ. See Mede's Works, p. 753.

† See the Bishop of Bristol's Dissertations on Prophecy. Rev. vi. 12—17. V. iii. p. 69.

the sword; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.

It is probable that our LORD, * as was sometimes done by the prophets, having first delivered these things in figurative diction, did then open the meaning of the prophecy to the four Apostles with whom he was in private. ST. LUKE hath recorded the explanatory part, ST. MATTHEW only the figurative. And if we inquire why he chose it in preference to the other, it seems evidently to have been, because he wrote in *Judea*, while there were reasons of prudence, respecting not only the Jews the subject of the prophecy, † but the safety and even ‡ the prejudices of the first believers, not to speak more openly of such a total and long subversion of the Jewish state. But then it is as evident, that ST. LUKE had not written in *Judea* before him. For had this been the case, what should induce ST. MATTHEW to couch the prophecy under allegory and symbols, when the literal sense had been already opened, and might be read by every one in the clearest terms? There cannot be a plainer sign, I think, of the precedence of ST. MATTHEW.

9. §. Matth. xxvi. 64. Mark xiv. 62. Luke xxii. 69.

<p><i>Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand OF POWER.</i></p>	<p><i>Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand OF THE POWER OF GOD.</i></p>
---	---

§ POWER among the Jews was one of the names of GOD himself: in which sense it was here used by CHRIST and taken

* See Isai. v. 7. Ezek. xvii. 12. xx. 45—49. Compared with xxi. 1—7. See *Lewin's* Comment.

† Act. vi. 14.

‡ Ib. i. 6. xxi. 20. &c.

§ See *Wolfius* on the place in St. Matthew, and *Selden*, to whom he refers, *De jure Nat. et Gentium*, p. 264. who says, Sexcenties apud magistros inter Dei cognomina usurpatur.

by

DISCOURSE IV. SECT. III. 101

by the council. ST. LUKE gives a sort of paraphrase of it, that the high import of the word might readily be conceived by strangers to the Jewish idiom.

10. §. The tenth chapter of ST. LUKE appears to have been written with reference to the tenth of ST. MATTHEW. For CHRIST in the course of his ministry having appointed two millions of his disciples, and having each time given them a charge at sending them forth; the first, which was to the twelve Apostles, is recorded by ST. MATTHEW, without notice taken of the latter. But ST. LUKE, touching lightly on that to the Twelve, dwells on the second to the Seventy Disciples. The instructions being similar in both, he might very properly do this, if he wrote after ST. MATTHEW; but if he had preceded him or not seen his Gospel, it is natural to believe, that he would have been fullest on the charge which was first given, and to the prime disciples.

SECT. III.

ST. MATTHEW wrote very early.

IF we attend a little further to the diction and some other circumstances of ST. MATTHEW's Gospel, we may see reason to conclude, that he was not only anterior to ST. MARK and ST. LUKE, but wrote several years before either of them. And these things will merit our attention the more, if the notes of an early publication are at the same time notes of the authenticity of his Gospel.

1. §. HE alone ascribes those titles of sanctity to *Jerusalem*,
* by which it had been distinguished by the prophets and sacred

* Nehem. xi. 1. 18. Isai. xlviii. 2. Dan. ix. 24.

historians,

historians, and was known among the * neighbouring nations. In the history of the Temptation † ST. LUKE says, *And he brought him to JERUSALEM, and set him on a pinnacle of the temple; but ST. MATTHEW, Then the devil taketh him up into THE HOLY CITY, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple.* He relates in another place, that ‡ *many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of their graves after his resurrection, and went into THE HOLY CITY, and appeared unto many.* Jerusalem is called in his Gospel, as in the Psalms, § THE CITY OF THE GREAT KING; and, as we have before observed, THE HOLY PLACE. ST. MARK, who had the same occasion to speak of this *holy ground*, uses another expression;

Matth. xxiv. 15.

Mark xiii. 14.

When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by the prophet Daniel, standing in THE HOLY PLACE,

(who so readeth let him understand)

then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains.

But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by the prophet Daniel, standing WHERE IT OUGHT

NOT,

(who so readeth let him understand)

then let them which be in Judea flee to the mountains.

An exact agreement of the two passages in other respects makes it look, as if the alteration was made on purpose to avoid the title of *Holy Place*. For which and the like differences between ST. MATTHEW and the other Evangelists, may we not account in this manner? After some years the word of GOD, being received by multitudes in various parts of the

* See in Prideaux's Connect. Part i. under the year A. C. 610. an account of the great city Cadytis mentioned by Herodotus, B. ii. Chap. 159. iii, 5.

† Luke iv. 9. Matth. iv. 5.

‡ Matth. xxvii. 52, 53.

§ Matth. v. 35. Psalm xlvi. 2.

world,

world, did as it were sanctify other cities; while *Jerusalem*, by rancorous opposition to the truth and sanguinary persecutions of it, more and more declined in the esteem of the believers. They acknowledged the title and character, which she claimed by ancient prescription, when ST. MATTHEW wrote; but between the publication of his Gospel and the next, * were taught to transfer the idea of THE HOLY CITY, the mother of the true ISRAEL, to a worthier object.

2. §. He testifies also a higher veneration than they for the TEMPLE. † In describing our LORD's public entry into *Jerusalem* they say, "*He went into the Temple;*" ST. MATTHEW, "*He went into the TEMPLE OF GOD.*" ‡ In relating the evidence of the false witnesses at the Trial, ST. MARK chooses one deposition, "*We heard him say I will destroy this temple that is made with hands;*" ST. MATTHEW another, "*I am able to destroy THE TEMPLE OF GOD, and to build it in three days.*" § He mentions a discourse of CHRIST in which the false glosses of the Scribes and Pharisees are refuted by arguments drawn from the holiness of the Altar, and of the Temple, and from the residence of the Divine Majesty in it. The Temple had a peculiar sacredness, till the Son of GOD came to || TABERNACLE among men, and even till He our passover was sacrificed for us. Yet only ST. MATTHEW continues on the notion of this sacredness to the death of CHRIST. No other writer of the New Testament calls it *the Temple of GOD* in treating of a time after the birth of our LORD. ST. LUKE speaks of an action done before it, when he says, that *Zacharias went into THE TEMPLE* [or sanctuary] OF THE LORD to

* See Gal. iv. 25, 26. See also Heb. xii. 22.

† Mark xi. 15. Luke xix. 45. Matth. xxi. 12.

‡ Mark xiv. 58. Matth. xxvi. 61.

§ Matth. xxiii. 16—21.

|| John i. 14. Ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν. Sanctuarium sanctuariorum est ipse Messias, sanctificatus de filiis David. Rabbi Moses Gerundensis ap. Grot. in Joan. ii. 19.

burn incense. * And it is without success, that some learned men have attempted to prove, that THE TEMPLE OF GOD in 2 Theff. ii. 4. means the temple at Jerusalem.

3. §. ST. MATTHEW uses the word GOSPEL four times; iv. 23. ix. 35. xxiv. 14. xxvi. 13. In the three former he calls it THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM. In the fourth he says, *Wheresoever this Gospel* [τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῷ] *shall be preached.* From hence one would judge, that it was then considered as a word of general meaning that signified any *good tidings*, and was not yet become an appropriate term of the church for the good tidings declared by CHRIST and his Apostles. When ST. MARK wrote, this was grown to be the settled and familiar sense of it: for he says simply THE GOSPEL in several places.

4. §. THE language of an early writer appears again in ST. MATTHEW when he speaks of the Apostles. † At the first enumeration of them he calls them the *twelve Apostles*, and after that constantly the *twelve Disciples*, till in the twenty-sixth chapter, v. 14. and 47. where the perfidy of JUDAS is the subject, he styles him, *One of the twelve*, perhaps with a certain lenity of expression, that he might not seem to aggravate the guilt of JUDAS by reminding the reader, that he was not only a constant attendant but a chosen disciple. Whatever the reason was, these two are the only instances of saying simply THE TWELVE throughout his Gospel, according to the *Vulgate*, ‡ and the more approved copies of the Greek. But if the reading of our Translators in v. 20. of this chapter, *He sat down with the TWELVE*, is to be received, still it is certain, that ST. MATTHEW had well prepared us, before he supposed us to understand, who the TWELVE were. Whereas the other Evangelists begin early with this appellation, and scarce use any

* See the Bishop of Bristol's Dissert. on Prophecy. Dissert. xxiii. V. ii. p. 369.

† x. 2.

‡ Among others the Alexandrian MS. See Mill on the verse.

other.

other. Because by the time when they wrote, THE TWELVE was become the common designation of the twelve Apostles, * and the established language of the church.

5. §. THERE is a like difference between ST. MATTHEW and the two other Evangelists in speaking of ST. JOHN. † ST. MARK at first calls him *the brother of JAMES*, but as soon as he has related the death of the Baptist, changes his stile, and calls him only JOHN. ‡ When ST. LUKE first mentions him, he intitles him *the son of ZEBEDEE*, but never afterwards. ST. MATTHEW, who often says singly PETER, has not named ST. JOHN without adding, that he was *the son of ZEBEDEE*, or, *the brother of JAMES*. The reason seems to be, that in a course of years this Apostle was so eminent in the church, that JOHN without epithet or distinction was understood to be JOHN the Apostle; but when ST. MATTHEW wrote, to be rather JOHN the Baptist.

6. §. ANOTHER circumstance concerning ST. JOHN, which we find in ST. LUKE, favours the early date of ST. MATTHEW's Gospel; if we may argue from what he has omitted. § The first step towards the enlargement of the church beyond the people of the Jews, was the conversion of the Samaritans by PHILIP the deacon. For whose confirmation in the faith the college of Apostles sent to them PETER and JOHN. || The latter had not long before expressed a strong enmity to their nation, by wishing to command fire from heaven to consume one of their villages. The knowledge of which fact, while their faith was in an infant and feeble state, might have alienated their minds from Him who was now their spiritual father, and given an opportunity of sowing dissensions and raising disturbances among them, which the open enemies, or false friends

* 1 Cor. xv. 5. And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the TWELVE.

† Compare Mark i. 19. iii. 17. v. 37. with ix. 2.

‡ Luke v. 10.

§ Acts viii. 5—14.

|| Luke ix. 54.

of the Gospel, such as SIMON MAGUS, would gladly seize. Here then ST. MATTHEW acted as prudence required of one who wrote near the time of their conversion: he left the offence of ST. JOHN, and the heavenly rebuke which it received, to be recorded by a future Evangelist. The silence of ST. MATTHEW and the narrative of ST. LUKE are the more remarkable in this case, as departures from the rule to which they severally adhere, * ST. MATTHEW of divulging the failings of the Apostles, and ST. LUKE of concealing them.

7. §. THOUGH ST. MATTHEW has been careful to do all justice to the zeal and fortitude shown by JOHN the Baptist in reproving the vices of HEROD the tetrarch; he is less severe than † ST. MARK or ‡ ST. LUKE in speaking of this prince; and in particular, he takes no notice of the insults offered by him to our LORD on the morning of the Crucifixion: which were more likely to make an impression on the minds of the Galilean believers, than the beheading of the Baptist. The most obvious account of this conduct in ST. MATTHEW is, that HEROD was still reigning in *Galilee*, and he was unwilling to display more than was absolutely necessary of the bad part of his character, that he might excite neither jealousy in HEROD of his believing subjects, nor disaffection in them to their sovereign. But if he was influenced by these motives, he must have written before the year of our LORD XXXIX; for in that year HEROD was deposed, and banished to *Lions* by CALIGULA.

8. §. THE Herodian family may help to carry the date a little higher. HEROD ANTIPAS, who beheaded JOHN the

* See Disc. v. Sect. ii. §. 3.

† Compare Mark viii. 15. and Matth. xvi. 6.

Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of <i>Herod</i> .	Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the <i>Sadducees</i> .
--	--

‡ See Luke iii. 19. xiii. 31, 32. xxiii. 11.

Baptist,

Baptist, was son of HEROD the Great. HEROD AGRIPPA, who beheaded ST. JAMES, was son of ARISTOBULUS and grandson of HEROD the Great. ST. LUKE calls the grandfather * HEROD KING OF JUDEA, and the grandson † HEROD THE KING. The latter was advanced to royalty, as king of PHILIP's tetrarchy, by CALIGULA. CLAUDIUS invested him afterwards with regal power over *Judea*. Yet it may be questioned, whether he ever bore his grandfather's title of king of *Judea*. ST. LUKE seems to express himself, as usually, with accuracy in stiling him only ‡ HEROD THE KING. ST. MATTHEW intitles HEROD the Great simply § HEROD THE KING. It may therefore well be supposed, that he wrote before he knew, that there was another HEROD THE KING, whose territory was Jewish. But HEROD AGRIPPA was thus dignified in the year of our LORD XXXVII. After which ST. MATTHEW would probably have added a mark of distinction to the grandfather's name, as ST. LUKE has done; and as he himself distinguishes between HEROD THE KING, and HEROD THE TETRARCH,

9. §, BUT a circumstance in his Gospel respecting PILATE may dispose us to fix the date of it still a little nearer to the Ascension. As soon as he begins to relate, chap. xxvii. that our LORD was led prisoner from the the Jewish council to the *prætorium*, he begins to speak of PILATE as GOVERNOR: The GOVERNOR asked, the GOVERNOR answered; and so on. Why this frequent mention of GOVERNOR, for it occurs nine times, but because it belonged to PILATE as still GOVERNOR of *Judea*, while ST. MATTHEW was writing? ST. MARK,

* Ch. i. ver. 5.

† Act xii. 1.

‡ Archelao Viennam reſegato Judæa in formulam provinciæ eſt redacta; quod quam vim habeat peritis rerum Romanarum ſatis eſt compertum. Ab eo tempore nullus unquam poſtea Judææ neque Rex fuit neque Ethnarcha. Iſaac. Caſaubon, Exercitat. i. n. 2. p. 22. Fol.

§ ii. 1.

108 DISCOURSE IV. SECT. III.

ST. LUKE, and ST. JOHN, say only PILATE on the same occasion, and never once call him GOVERNOR.

* Upon a complaint of the Samaritans, VITELLIUS president of Syria ordered PILATE to Rome, to answer to it before the Emperor. JOSEPHUS says, that in obedience to this order *he made haste to Rome*, but before he got thither the Emperor was dead. The death of TIBERIUS was in the spring, A. D. XXXVII. By which time probably ST. MATTHEW's Gospel was written.

10. §. ST. MATTHEW in a certain masterly way gives the essential circumstances of our LORD's miracles, but he is the least distinct and particular in reciting them. He was in haste, as was before observed, to introduce CHRIST speaking, and judged perhaps, that the notoriety of these recent miracles did not then require a minuter description. As the Evangelists receded from the time and place in which the works were done, they became more explicit in their narrations; to satisfy the pious inquiries of the faithful, and to guard them against falsity by an exacter detail of facts. This is very visible in whatever ST. JOHN undertook to relate. And it may be observed in several instances of ST. LUKE. He mentions the appearances of CHRIST to the disciples after his resurrection, and his conferences with them, more at large than the preceding Evangelists. And though he reserved the circumstances of the Ascension for the Acts of the Apostles, yet we find a fuller account of it in his Gospel than in ST. MARK's. ST. MATTHEW makes no direct mention of it. He had deduced his history to the time, when CHRIST who died for our sins was risen again for our justification, and being invested with all power in heaven and in earth, commanded his disciples to teach all nations, and assured them of his presence with them to the end of the world. Here he thought proper to close his Gospel.

* Josephus. Antiq. B. xviii. C. iv. §. 2.

But

DISCOURSE IV. SECT. IV. 109

But if he had not written while the ASCENSION was fresh in memory, and the spectators of it continued together at *Jerusalem*, he could scarce have failed to take notice of it.

S E C T. IV.

Some objections considered and answered.

1. §. * YET learned men think, they discover marks of a lower date in ST. MATTHEW's writings. They argue from the knowledge which he shows of the spirituality of the Gospel, and of the excellence of the moral above the ceremonial law, of the extent of CHRIST's kingdom on earth, of the calling of the Gentiles and rejection of the Jews. Of which things they suppose him not to have treated, till a course of years had unfolded their meaning, and given him a clearer discernment of their nature.

2. §. BUT it may be answered, first with regard to the doctrinal part of his Gospel, that if he exhibits a noble idea of pure religion and morality, he teaches no more than he had heard often taught, often opposed to the maxims of the Jews by his Divine Instructor. And when the HOLY SPIRIT, the guide to all the truth, had descended upon him, it seems strange to imagine, that he still wanted twenty or thirty years to enlighten his mind. If he was not then furnished with knowledge to relate these doctrines as an Evangelist, how was he qualified to preach them to the Jews as an Apostle?

3. §. IN the next place, it is true that the prophetic parts of his Gospel declare the extent of CHRIST's kingdom, and the calling and acceptance of the Gentiles. But these events had

* See Lardner's Suppl. V. i. p. 110—116.

been

been plainly foretold by the ancient prophets, and were expected by devout Israelites to happen in the days of the MESSIAH. * ZACHARIAS, the father of the Baptist, speaks of CHRIST as coming *to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death*: which description denotes or includes the Gentiles. And SIMEON calls him in direct terms, *A light to lighten the Gentiles*. And what more does ST. MATTHEW say, than that the Gospel would be successfully preached among the Gentiles in all parts of the earth? He no where teaches, that they should be received into the church without circumcision and submission to the Levitical law. Freedom from this yoke was rather intimated than proclaimed by our blessed LORD, perhaps as one of those things, † which then the Apostles could not bear; and it remained a mystery to them, ‡ till it was signified to ST. PETER by vision, and explained by the descent of the HOLY SPIRIT upon CORNELIUS and his friends. § It will be shown elsewhere, that the proper inference from these parts of ST. MATTHEW's Gospel is of another kind.

4. §. BUT, it is added, he mentions prophecies and prophetic parables, which speak of the rejection and overthrow of the Jews. If this argument means, that being at first prejudiced in favour of a kingdom to be restored to ISRAEL, he could not understand these prophecies, and therefore would not soon think of relating them; though we should admit the premises, we may justly deny the conclusion. He might not clearly discern in what manner the predictions were to be accomplished, yet he must see, what they all denounced, that those who rejected the Gospel GOD would reject; and hence he had always an inducement to notify them to his countrymen; and the sooner he apprized them of their danger, the greater charity he showed them.

* Luke i. 79. and ii. 32.

† John xvi. 12.

§ See Sect. v. §. 17. of this Discourse.

‡ See Acts x.

5. §. AN objection drawn from his Gospel is still behind. He says of the Potter's field purchased with the price of JUDAS's perfidy, * as Dr. SCOTT translates the words,

Ch. xxvii. 8. *Wherefore that field hath been called, The field of blood until this day.*

He says again of the report, which the soldiers who guarded the sepulchre spread at the instigation of the Jewish rulers, That the disciples came by night and stole away the body of CHRIST while they slept :

xxviii. 15. *And this report has been spread among the Jews until this day.*

It is urged, they must have been events of a considerable standing, of which he could speak in this manner.

ST. MATTHEW shows plainly, that he speaks of two things which were still subsisting when he wrote ; but I see not, that his expression, especially if we consider the subject to which he applies it, requires us to suppose that they had subsisted a long while : for what things is he speaking of ? *Palpable lies*, and *new names* of places, which have had others from ancient usage and apparent reason, are beings of such a perishable nature and casual existence, that a single year was sufficient to give propriety to the observation, that they then continued. It was memorable that the *name* had fastened on the field, and strange that the *lie* had lasted so long.

6. §. HISTORIC evidence is brought in aid of these arguments : and to the testimonies produced in the beginning of this discourse, the higher authority of IRENÆUS † is opposed in a passage, of which I will give a literal version ;

* Scott's New Version of St. Matthew's Gospel.

† Lardner's Supplement, V. i. p. 102. Irenæus, B. iii. C. 1.

“ Now

“ Now MATTHEW among the Hebrews published also a
 “ written Gospel; PETER and PAUL evangelizing at Rome,
 “ and founding the church there; but after their departure,
 “ MARK the disciple and interpreter of PETER, he also deli-
 “ vered to us in writing what was preached by PETER; and
 “ LUKE the follower of PAUL recorded in a book the Gospel
 “ preached by him. Afterwards JOHN the disciple of the
 “ LORD, the same who leaned on his breast, he also set forth a
 “ Gospel residing at *Ephesus in Asia*.”

It is taken for granted, that PETER AND PAUL EVANGELIZING AT ROME must mean, WHILE PETER AND PAUL WERE EVANGELIZING AT ROME. But what becomes of the argument, if EVANGELIZING has here the nature of a substantive, (* for which such participles are used in Greek) and the words are to be thus understood, PETER and PAUL *being the EVANGELIZERS, or, preachers at Rome?* Which I apprehend may be done without any violence to the language or design of IRENÆUS.

It is evident, that his main design was to declare, *From whom and how the churches had received the doctrine which they held.* And therefore after a general account of the qualifications of the Apostles by the power of the HOLY SPIRIT, and that they went forth, and evangelized the nations; he descends to particulars and says, MATTHEW *published also a written Gospel*; that is, he was both a preacher and writer of the word. He then informs us, that PETER and PAUL *were the preachers of it at Rome*, but that what they preached was written by MARK and LUKE. So that the sentence concerning PETER and PAUL relates to what follows it, and was designed to show, not that MATTHEW was writing among the Hebrews and they preaching to the Romans *at the same time*, but that the doctrine

* Thus Luke ii. 2. *ἡγεμονεύοντες* is the same thing as if St. Luke had said *ἡγεμόνες*, according to Dr. Lardner, who renders the passage, *This was the first assise of Cyrenius governor of Syria.* Credib. V. 1. p. 420. Where see more instances of a similar kind.

was *the same*, which was preached by PETER and PAUL, and written by MARK and LUKE : for this is the point on which he is intent. And this, which I believe to be the true construction of the passage, has appeared so to others. * Dr. WALL says, " IRENÆUS is there speaking in a general way, " not minding at that place any chronological matter or syn- " chronism." † And on this side of the question the passage is explained by Dr. WELLS. But if our opponents insist on the common interpretation as just, we may in this instance as lawfully refuse the authority of IRENÆUS though very respectable, as they who will have it to be decisive in one part of this passage, may disregard it in another. IRENÆUS says, that MATTHEW *published a written Gospel among the Hebrews, or, in Judea.* ‡ But in this point no attention is paid to his testimony. And yet if there was any mistake in the history which he had received of this Gospel, it was more likely to be a mistake of the *precise time* than of the *country* in which it came forth.

7. §. As the objections then by no means balance the weight of evidence in the other scale, we may still rest secure, that ST. MATTHEW's Gospel was published, when the situation of the church with respect to its own members, and the Jews without seems to have required one, by the beginning of the year XXXVII.

And thus we have a proof independent of the preceding comparisons, that ST. MARK and ST. LUKE, who came often to *Jerusalem* and conversed familiarly with the Apostles, must have seen ST. MATTHEW's Gospel before they composed their own. ST. MARK, who I conceive will appear to be the first writer of the two, concludes with an intimation, that he did not write, till after the Apostles had quitted their residence in

* Critical Notes on the New Testament, p. 1, 2.

† Paraphrase on the New Test. Preface to St. Matthew.

‡ Lardner's Supplement, V. i. p. 125, 126.

Judea, and had preached the faith with success in various parts of the earth. *And they went forth and preached every where, the LORD working with them, and confirming the word with signs following.* xvi. 20.

S E C T. V.

ST. MATTHEW wrote for the Jews, and in Judea.

THE voice of antiquity accords with IRENÆUS in testifying that ST. MATTHEW wrote for the instruction of the Jewish nation. And if we will allow, that he has given us not a mere collection of evangelical facts and doctrines, but a collection made with choice and design, we must admit this testimony as true. Whatever is characteristic in his Gospel has a plain reference to the condition, manners, and principles of this people.

I. §. HE begins with intitling JESUS CHRIST *the son of ABRAHAM* and *the son of DAVID*; and divides his genealogy into three parts, answering to so many remarkable periods in their history; every one of which was early distinguished by predictions concerning the MESSIAH, peculiarly interesting to them; * the *first*, By the promise to ABRAHAM, that in HIS SEED *all the nations of the earth should be blessed*; † in the renewal of which promise ISAAC was chosen before ISHMAEL, ‡ and in the bequest of which as an inheritance JACOB was preferred to ESAU; the *second*, by assurances to § DAVID, that the promised Seed should spring from his loins; || to whom the greatness of his character, offices, and acts was revealed, and by whom, as a prophet, it was represented to Israel; the *third*, By marking * an æra of seventy weeks, or four hundred

* Gen xxii. 18.
§ 2 Sam. vii. 16.

† xxvi. 4.
|| Psalm cx. &c.

‡ xxvii. 27—29. xxviii. 4.
* Dan. ix. 24—27.

and

and ninety and years, before the end of which the MESSIAH should come, * and foreshowing a sign of his advent in the appearance of his messenger.

In this genealogy, when he mentions JACOB the last of their common ancestors, † he keeps up the idea of relation between *this promised Seed* and them by noting, that JUDAS from whom our LORD sprang, and the other heads of their twelve tribes were brethren, JACOB *begat JUDAS and his brethren.*

2. §. In speaking next of the birth of JESUS he could have told them what the Angel announced to the blessed Virgin ; ‡ *The LORD GOD shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Israel for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.* But since they had such a propensity to mistake the MESSIAH's character, and to turn a spiritual into a temporal kingdom, he makes but little mention of the royalty of CHRIST till the time of viewing him § on a throne of judgement, when he shall gather all nations before him, not to heap honours on the wicked or worthless *Israelite*, but "to render to every man according to his deeds." He now exhibits another office of CHRIST, an office which few of them considered as belonging to him, but on which their real and permanent felicity depended, || HE SHALL SAVE HIS PEOPLE FROM THEIR SINS.

3. §. HE then begins to show, that the prophecies relating to the MESSIAH were fulfilled in the person of JESUS ; and makes considerable use of this argument, which the two next Evangelists scarce touch upon, unless when they recite our SAVIOUR's own words. This he did for the sake of those * who

* Malachi iii. 1.

† Obiter Matthæus Christum ut cognatum omnibus Israelitis commendat. *Grot.* in locum.

‡ Luke i. 32, 33.

§ xxv. 31—46.

|| i. 21.

* Trypho the Jew says to Justin Martyr, I would not have heard you, if you had not referred every thing to Scripture. *Dial. cum Tryphone*, p. 254. Ed. Thirlby.

insisted much on this evidence; and in doing it plainly considers his readers as conversant in the prophecies which he lays before them. The fifty third chapter of ISAIAH is a description of CHRIST throughout, and the sacred writers frequently appeal to it. But ST. MATTHEW * having shown, that CHRIST is the person of whom it treats, refers to it no more, but leaves it with his reader to carry on the parallel between the prediction, and the verification of it in JESUS.

4. §. THE second chapter relates the arrival of the Eastern Sages at *Jerusalem*, their inquiry after the new-born KING OF THE JEWS, whose star they had seen in their own country; the question concerning the destined place of his nativity insidiously proposed to the Sanhedrim by HEROD, and his cruelty at *Bethlehem* in consequence of their answer. These were events well known to many then living in *Judea*; and were too singular and extraordinary not to merit a serious consideration.

5. §. IN the third chapter, ST. MATTHEW seems again to speak to the knowledge of his contemporaries, in relating the first interview between JESUS and JOHN the Baptist, and that JOHN humbly declined baptizing him. At that time † JOHN *knew him not*. Whence then that awe and reverence of a private stranger? This seems a difficulty to us; but probably was none to those who had seen and heard CHRIST *in the flesh*. They readily conceived from their own observation and experience, that his heavenly countenance and discourse made such impression on the man of GOD, (an impression which his sanctified mind had a peculiar aptness to receive) that he quickly felt his own inferiority, and with free acknowledgement of it said, *I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?*

* viii. 17. On the propriety of the application see the excellent note of *Grotius*.

† John i. 31. 33.

6. §. THE

6. §. THE fifth and two following chapters contain the Sermon on the mount; which ST. LUKE also recites, but more concisely, and with omissions of two sorts. *First*, He reserves several instructions for future occasions on which they were again delivered: * for it may be remarked of him, that he rarely repeats the same doctrine, or a similar miracle or event. *Secondly*, He passes over those things which were spoken more immediately to the Jews, to correct their false conceptions concerning the kingdom of the MESSIAH, and the nature and measures of obedience due to the laws of GOD.

† For this Sermon was delivered to an auditory, many of whom had little idea of the demands of universal justice, or that they were to be called to felicity by the practice of it; but imagined that their happy state under MESSIAH their leader and king would consist in worldly prosperity, in the abundance of wealth, pleasures, power, and honour, obtained by conquest and dominion over the rest of mankind; and that during the course of their arms the moral law would be silent, and leave them to the free gratification of their revenge, ambition, and lusts. To these persons our LORD, having briefly described the tempers and characters of which true beatitude will be the recompence, declares, ‡ that they who enlisted under him as their leader must become useful and eminent in a world lying

* For example, he mentions only one teaching on shipboard, v. 3. the stilling but of one storm on the lake of *Galilee*, viii. 22—25. one miraculous feeding of a multitude with loaves and fishes, ix. 12—17. one healing of a paralytic, v. 18. for he does not say that the centurion's servant, vii. 2. had the palsy, but only that *he was sick and ready to die*; he exhibits only one woman anointing our LORD, vii. 38. of all which works ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK relate either more or different instances: and his silence in some of them is remarkable. He observes in general the same rule with regard to our LORD's precepts and instructions. We may therefore safely admit the discourse in chapt. vi. to be the Sermon on the mount; in which the beginning, order of instructions and conclusion are the same as in ST. MATTHEW; from whom he does not vary more in this Sermon, than in the prophecy on Mount Olivet, chap. xxi. compared with Matth. xxiv. For the little difficulty about the *mountain* or the *plain*, and the *sitting* or *standing* posture of CHRIST, See CLARKE's Paraphrase on Luke vi. 17—20.

† See Blair's Paraphrase on the Sermon on the Mount.

‡ v. 13—16.

in corruption and darkneſs, by purity of manners and the luſtre of good example ; by which the nations might be won, not to pay homage to them, but to give glory to GOD by a like obedience to his holy will. * That he came not to abrogate but compleat what is ſpiritual and holy in the law and prophets ; and they were greatly deceived, if they flattered themſelves with a releaſement from any part of GOD's moral law, which is of ſacred and perpetual obligation, and renders all guilty before Him, who wilfully break the leaſt of its commandments, and who teach others to break them : † and that therefore even thoſe profeſſors of the Moſaic law, to whom the reſt looked up as models of perfection in life and doctrine, fell far ſhort of the righteouſneſs which was neceſſary to gain admittance into the kingdom of heaven. ‡ He then lays down ſome important principles of forgivenes, chaſtity, ſimplicity, meekneſs, and extenſive charity, which muſt centre in the heart, and animate the whole conduct of his followers, § through the aſſiſtance which is offered them from above, if they hoped to be bleſſed by adhering to him. And he ſtill levels his doctrine againſt the falſe gloſſes of their expoſitors, and the imperfect rules of their moralists.

|| In another part, with a like oppoſition to certain ſemblances of piety then proper to the Jews, he ſpeaks of *alms*, and *prayer*, and *faſting* ; and aſſures them, that they who publiſhed their charities by ſound of trumpet, who prayed ſtanding in the ſtreets, and faſted with diſfigured faces to be ſeen of men, muſt expect no further reward of their works, than the vain applauſe of the multitude, which was the chief incentive to perform them.

And though theſe will be leſſons inſtructive to the church of CHRIST, as long as he ſhall have a church militant on earth, yet ST. MATTHEW might record them with a view to his own nation in the firſt inſtance ; and that he did ſo, may be

* v. 17—19.
|| vi. 1—18.

† 20.

‡ 21—48.

§ vii. 7—12.

judged by the marked contrariety of these precepts to the maxims or practice of the Jews, and by the total omission of them in ST. LUKE.

One method of institution was suited to such as renounced the whole of their religion as vain, and another needful for those who cherished the errors they had grafted on a true religion as the fairest part of it. And this being the case of the *Jews*, ST. MATTHEW, that he might extirpate what was false, and cultivate the truth in their minds, gave a fuller account of this divine Sermon.

7. §. * THE first miracle specified by him is the healing of a *leper*; and he seems to give it the precedence, † though it was not the first in order of time, that he might begin with a work which proved to them, on Scripture authority and their own principles, the divine mission and power of JESUS. ‡ For by such a sign did MOSES convince the house of Israel, that GOD had sent him to be their deliverer: § “ And the Jews “ themselves confess, that leprosy is the finger of GOD, a disease peculiarly of his sending and removing; and that it is “ not lawful for the physician (or any but the priest directed “ and appointed in his course) so much as to attempt the cure “ of it. Thus saith Rabbi MENACHEM on Lev. xiii.”

In ST. LUKE's Gospel, designed for other readers, || the miraculous cure which stands foremost to view is that of a person possessed: which displayed the power of CHRIST over those *demons* to whom the Gentiles sacrificed.

8. §. ST. MATTHEW, who had before warned the Jews * by the words of JOHN the Baptist, that their descent from ABRAHAM, in which they placed such confidence, would not avail them without sincere repentance, shows them afterwards,

* viii. 2—4.

§ Hammond on the place.

* Matth. iii. 9.

† See John ii. 11.

|| Luke iv. 33—36.

‡ Exod. iv. 7. 8. 31.

that

that it would as little profit them without true faith. To provoke them to a jealousy of their birth-right, they are intitled *The children of the kingdom*, as they, to whom the adoption and the covenants appertained, and whose were the fathers; but at the same time are told, that unbelief would be the forfeiture of all these privileges.

viii. 11, 12. *I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. But THE CHILDREN OF THE KINGDOM shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.*

In a similar monition related by * ST. LUKE there is no mention of *the children of the kingdom*.

9. §. HE endeavours to excite a sense of gratitude by reminding them, that the kingdom of GOD was first offered to them:

x. 5, 6. *Go ye not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go ye rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.*

† The other Evangelists are silent about this part of the charge to the Apostles. Again,

xv. 24. *I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.*

These words of CHRIST are not in the parallel place of ST. MARK, vii. 24—30.

10. §. HE is studious to satisfy them, that JOHN the Baptist was the ELIAS foretold by MALACHI, iv. 5. *Behold, I will send*

* Luke xiii. 28, 29.

† See Mark vi. 7—11. Luke ix. 3—5.

you Elias the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the LORD. On which prophecy they laid such stress, that they would hear of no MESSIAH, whose coming was not preceded by ELIAS * or a prophet resembling him: and † TRYPHO the Jew in his conference with JUSTIN MARTYR contends, "That CHRIST could neither know himself, nor be endowed with any power, till ELIAS came and anointed him." That therefore they might conceive a just idea of the character and office of JOHN, ST. MATTHEW informs them, that the institutions of the law, and the writings of the prophets were all significant of things to come till JOHN appeared, with whom the completion of them began; and if they would open their eyes to the truth, in a matter of great importance to them, they would perceive, that he was the predicted ELIAS.

xi. 13, 14. *For all the law and the prophets prophesied until John; and if ye will receive it, THIS IS ELIAS WHICH WAS FOR TO COME. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.*

ST. LUKE ‡, who has the foregoing part of our LORD's discourse concerning JOHN, almost in the same words with ST. MATTHEW, stops short of this passage. Again,

xvii. 12, 13. *I say unto you, that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed*—THEN THE DISCIPLES UNDERSTOOD, THAT HE SPAKE UNTO THEM OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

The observation, which is wanting in ST. MARK, ix. 13. *That he spake to them of JOHN THE BAPTIST*, is an instance of ST. MATTHEW's great care to ascertain, who this ELIAS was.

* See Bp. Chandler's Defence of Christianity, p. 233.

† Justin Martyr's Dial. with Trypho, p. 153. See also p. 235. Ed. Thirlby.

‡ Luke vii. 24—28.

11. §. AND that they who were disposed to embrace the faith might not be startled by the popular argument of their unbelieving countrymen, *Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?* he shows them, that the incredulity of their nation was an event foreseen and foretold.

xiii. 14, 15. *In them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand: and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive. For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.*

There is an allusion to this prophecy in * ST. MARK and ST. LUKE, but it is not expressly cited nor so fully stated.

12. §. HIS twenty third chapter contains a continued discourse of our LORD concerning the Scribes and Pharisees; in which he animadvertes upon some things that were singularly Judaical, and which ST. MARK and ST. LUKE do not mention, particularly that for a show of sanctity, *They made broad their phylacteries and enlarged the borders of their garments.* Our LORD begins this discourse with a command to his disciples to obey the Jewish rulers, and submit to their injunctions, though sometimes grievous to be borne. *The Scribes and Pharisees sit in MOSES' seat. All therefore that they bid you observe, that observe and do.* This was a precept to the circumcision; and the Gentiles had no direct concern in it, whom ST. PAUL exhorts, *to stand fast in the liberty wherewith CHRIST has made us free.* Gal. v. 1.

13. §. So also, chap. xxiv. 20. the direction to pray, *That their flight might not be on the sabbath day,* was inserted for the

* Mark iv. 12. Luke viii. 10.

benefit of the believers, who lived in *Judea*, and particularly at *Jerusalem*, and would be considered as bound by the law of *MOSES*. The rigour of the Jews being such, that they themselves would very seldom attack, and sometimes not resist an enemy on the Sabbath, they certainly would not suffer any of their own nation to set out or travel with their families on that day.

Let us pause a moment to contemplate the success of this petition, which certainly the faithful preferred as they had been directed. * *CESTIUS GALLUS*, the president of *Syria*, advancing to *Jerusalem* with his army, took possession of the lower city, and assaulted the upper. But when a little perseverance would have made him master of it and of the Temple, he decamped unexpectedly in the night. † The ensigns of idolatry or abomination had then been *standing in the holy place*; which to those who believed in *CHRIST* was the signal of escape: and doubtless from that instant they held themselves in readiness to retreat from *Jerusalem*, as soon as the way was open for flight. But Providence so ordered, that their flight should be neither in winter nor on the Sabbath. ‡ In *Judea* the cold and rainy season does not begin before the twelfth of December: and the army of *CESTIUS* retired to *Antipatris*, and was pursued by the Jews § on the eighth of the month *Dius*, that is, the eighth of November. || The eighth of November, in the year of our *LORD LXVI*. when this happened, was Saturday, or the Jewish Sabbath; by the end of which it would be known at *Jerusalem*, that the Romans were certainly fled to a distance with disgrace and loss. So that the Christians had the whole week before them, and a moderate season of the

* *Josephus*. Jewish War. B. ii. C. 19.

† Matth. xxiv. 15, 16.

‡ Mr. *Harmer's* Observations on divers Passages of Scripture, V. i. p. 28,

§ *Usher*, Dissertat. de Maced. et Asian. Anno Solari, C. i. says, that *Josephus*, in the History of the Jewish War, reckons by Julian or Roman months only with Syro-macedonian names. Accordingly the Archbishop in his Annals, under the year of the world 4070, calls this 8th of *Dius* the 8th of November.

|| The Dominical letter for the year of our *LORD LXVI*. was E.

year for their retreat, without fear of annoyance from the armies. And this was the critical instant of safety. For the controul of regular government ceasing, the bold and crafty at the head of a turbulent and frantic populace, began immediately to tyrannize over the sober citizens: and the Christians especially would have felt the rage of their mad zeal, rapine, and cruelty; which, with their intestine discords and tumults, * exhibited the scene of a ruining city before the Romans attacked it. The defeat of CESTIUS appeared in such a light to the confederate, that upon it *many of the noble Jews swam away from the city*, † says JOSEPHUS, *as from a ship that was sinking*. This too was in favour of the Christians, who would be less noted and more secure, for the number and power of those who withdrew at the same time. The mountains of *Perea* were within fifty miles of *Jerusalem*, and *Pella* about an hundred from it. This city, ‡ which is said to have been their chief rendezvous, was under the jurisdiction of king AGRIPPA, a friend and ally of the Romans; § who was providentially disposed to countenance the Christians. Here therefore they were exempt from the wars and miseries which wasted *Judea* for near four years, and caused the entire destruction of city and state.

14. §. ST. MATTHEW, who testifies a great esteem for ST. PETER, and places him at the head of the Apostles more plainly than the other Evangelists, yet dwells on the history of his fall as fully as ST. MARK, and mentions one circumstance more, that the second denial was *with an oath*. All ages may improve by this history, and it is therefore recited by all the Evangelists, as a lesson against self-confidence, a bright exam-

* Τὸ καὶ λίσσημα τῆς πόλεως πρὶν ἐπιτελεῖν Ῥωμαῖους ἢ οἷα ἀπολλυμένης. Joseph. Jewish War, B. ii. C. xxii. §. 1.

† Ibid. C. xx. §. 1.

‡ Euseb. Eccl. Hist. B. iii. C. 5. Epiphanius in Lib. de Ponderibus et Mensuris. p. 171. See *Reland's Palæstina*, p. 924.

§ See Acts xxvi. 28.

ple of the mercy of Heaven to those who grieve for their offences, and a manifestation, that ST. PETER's fortitude soon after was not his own but from above. But for some years from the Ascension, ST. PETER was the person who stood foremost in the cause of the faith; whom they who received it considered as the chief champion of truth, and they who rejected it, as the great abettor and ringleader of heresy. His reputation was of consequence on both sides, but must be lessened in the eyes of many by the knowledge of this fact. When therefore we reflect, in how early and critical a season ST. MATTHEW published it, we may reasonably conclude, that he divulged the guilt of his friend for the immediate benefit of his countrymen; ST. PETER, no doubt, entering into his views, and with great humility forwarding the design, * *That in him first JESUS CHRIST might show forth all long-suffering.* Many might have been intimidated as well as he to disown all acquaintance with CHRIST, when they saw him seized, arraigned, and condemned; some had joined in the cry for his crucifixion; others had opposed, blasphemed, or insulted him in the course of his ministry on earth. In some or other of these instances of guilt multitudes of Jews were involved; who yet soon afterwards might be *pricked at their hearts*, and say, *What shall we do?* To this question of distress and anguish the case of ST. PETER gave a most consoling answer, That their tears of repentance would be mercifully accepted, as his had been.

15. §. ST. MATTHEW records the answer of the Jews to PILATE, *Then answered all the people and said, HIS BLOOD BE ON US, AND ON OUR CHILDREN*, xxvii. 25. They themselves felt the force of this dread imprecation; and ST. MATTHEW, in transmitting it to after-ages, bequeathed their children a legacy of admonition, which may now be paraphrased in this manner:

* 1 Tim. i. 16.

“ What

* “What brought against you from far a nation of fierce countenance; laid in ashes your city, † the noblest of the eastern world, and your temple, the crown and glory of this city; depopulated your country, and made a ‡ fruitful land barren? What drew down vengeance by the sword, pestilence, and famine, on that generation, and scattered the sad remains of them over the face of the earth? What hath withholden honour and esteem from you in all succeeding times, hath caused you to be oppressed in many nations, and contemned in all; and hath given you “*a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind,*” in a long unsettled dispersion? The Providence of GOD punished the idolatry of your ancestors with a captivity of seventy years; but your visitation still continues after seventeen hundred. When they forsook their idols and returned to Him, he returned to them, and brought them unto their own land. You have all along hated idols, and are nevertheless without a country. Yet all the ways of the ALMIGHTY are equal. What then hath made ISRAEL so abhorred, what sin of a blacker die than idolatry? Your fathers denied the HOLY ONE and the JUST in the presence of PILATE, when he was determined to let him go. They called aloud with one voice for his crucifixion, and said, HIS BLOOD BE ON US, AND ON OUR CHILDREN; and as yet “their posterity praise their saying.” But be not ye “as your fathers, “a stubborn and rebellious generation;” mourn for their sins and your own; “look on him whom you have pierced,” and say, “Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the LORD:” that “in Him all the seed of ISRAEL may be justified.”

16. §. ST. MATTHEW mentions the report propagated among the Jews by the guard stationed at the sepulchre, § *His*

* See Deut. xxviii. 49, 50.

† Orinen, in qua fuere Hierosolyma, longe clarissima urbium Orientis, non Judææ modo. Plin. Nat. Hist. L. v. C. 14. V. i. p. 261. Ed. Hardouin.

‡ Uber solum. Tac. Hist. v. 6. Shaw's Travels, p. 365.

§ xxviii. 11—15.

disciples

*disciples came by night and stole him away while we slept ; and suggests to them, that the impunity of the guard was a sure mark of the untruth and absurdity of the report. The soldiers, against whom there was no other evidence, accuse themselves of a capital offence ; and the rulers, enraged at their negligence, let it pass unnoticed, when the punishment of it was the only method to make a story credible, the success of which they had so much at heart. HEROD AGRIPPA believing, or desirous to make the people believe, that ST. PETER had escaped from prison by the fault of the keepers, * commanded them to be put to death. And undoubtedly the like zeal or policy would have prompted these rulers to prosecute the guard, if they had dared to do it. Connivance in such a case was confession of a compact between them and the soldiers, and that one party had stipulated to affirm, what each knew to be false.*

The question maintained in this section, that ST. MATTHEW wrote for the instruction of the Jews, might be enforced by other instances ; but because the same things occur in ST. MARK, I have purposely omitted them, that I might confine the argument, except in the case of ST. PETER, to what is peculiar to ST. MATTHEW. In so clear a point what has been already offered were too much, if the doubts of learned moderns had not made it necessary.

17. §. YET I shall beg leave to add one remark more. The enlargement of the church by the accession of the Gentiles is announced, as was before observed, in many passages of ST. MATTHEW's Gospel. But what shall we infer from this circumstance ? That he did not write for the Jews in the first instance ; or that he did not write early ? View the matter in a just light, and you will see a different conclusion deducible from it. To testify to mankind, that the calling of the Gentiles was not an afterthought of the Apostles themselves be-

* Acts xii. 19.

cause the Jews rejected them, but an original part of the Gospel economy, it was fit and expedient, if not absolutely necessary, that what CHRIST had declared on this head, and the command which he had given his Apostles, * TO DISCIPLE ALL NATIONS, should be registered in a book published to the world while the church was yet confined to the circumcision. And I doubt not, the providence of Heaven caused a Gospel to be soon set forth for this among other wise and weighty reasons.

18. §. THE presumption is strong, that a work compiled for the use of the Jews was published in the country which the great body of them inhabited, and to which they resorted from all quarters of the earth. But a certain proof is the date of this Gospel; which, within a few years of the Ascension, could be written only in *Judea*, † where the twelve Apostles then constantly resided.

* Μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Matth. xxviii. 19.

† Cave's Hist. Literaria. V. i. p. 5. Col. 1. under *St. Peter*. Lardner's Suppl. V. i. Ch. vi. where this point is considered at large.

DISCOURSE THE FIFTH.

ON ST. MARK.

S E C T. I.

ST. MARK *wrote before* ST. LUKE.

OUR next attempt shall be to settle the order of ST. MARK and ST. LUKE, and to consider some other circumstances relating to their Gospels.

I. §. And first, Of the order in which they wrote.

* “ I cannot be induced,” says GROTIUS, “ to assent to the opinion entertained by some, that LUKE was prior in writing to MATTHEW and MARK. It is contradicted by the order in which the Gospels have been disposed from the earliest ages among all nations; it is contradicted by ancient testimony supported by the authority of IRENÆUS and TERTULLIAN; it is contradicted by LUKE himself; who has made additions to the history of MATTHEW and MARK, and when he relates the same thing, often uses their very words.”

To the same purpose † Dr. MILL affirms, “ That on comparing the three Gospels together, it appears clearer than

* Grotius on Luke i. 1.

† Mill's Prolegomena, Sect. cxvi, cxvii. p. 14.

“light, that LUKE’s was published after those of MATTHEW and MARK.”—“That in the parts of the evangelical history in which ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK agree, he seems to use the words sometimes of the one, and sometimes of the other; but where they differ a little in any minute circumstances, he suits his own narration to that of MARK; that he inserts many things into their relations; and often makes additions from the testimony of eye-witnesses.”

But we are not arguing from authorities, but from such evidence as the Gospels themselves afford. And if it appear by a comparison of parallel passages, that ST. LUKE’s narration is either plainer in itself or to a great body of believers, I shall think I am intitled to conclude, that he wrote after ST. MARK. For though elegance of stile might not be the aim of either, perspicuity and explication were undoubtedly the study of both. And since one of them has manifestly adopted many things from the other, the later writer might consistently follow, if he saw no opportunity of improving, the language of the preceding, but he certainly would not alter it for the worse.

2. §. ST. MATTHEW having related his own calling, then adds,

ix. 10. *And it came to pass, as JESUS sat at meat IN THE HOUSE, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples.*

ST. MARK having given the same account of the calling of MATTHEW or LEVI, says,

ii. 15. *And it came to pass, as JESUS sat at meat IN HIS HOUSE, many publicans and sinners sat also with JESUS and his disciples.*

Here JESUS being the guest, HIS HOUSE must mean the house of MATTHEW or LEVI; which he himself out of modesty and humility had left undetermined.

ST.

DISCOURSE V. SECT. I. 131

ST. LUKE however, as well to remove all possibility of doubt, as that what ST. MATTHEW had done might be *told for a memorial of him*, relates the matter in the following words:

v. 29. *And Levi made him a great feast * IN HIS OWN HOUSE, and there was a great company of publicans and others that sat down with them.*

There is therefore a gradation of clearness in the three accounts corresponding to the order in which we suppose the Gospels to have been written.

3. §. THE two Evangelists relate our LORD's reply to a cavil of the Pharisees, in these words:

Mark ii. 25, 26.

Luke vi. 3, 4.

And he said unto them,

And JESUS answering them, said,

Have ye never read

Have ye never read so much as this,

what David did

what David did

when he had need

when he was an hungred, he

and was an hungred, he

and they that were with him?

and they that were with him?

How he went into the house of

How he went into the house of

GOD,

GOD,

(in the days of Abiathar the high priest)

AND DID EAT

AND DID TAKE AND EAT,

AND GAVE ALSO TO THEM,

THAT WERE WITH HIM,

the shew-bread,

the shew-bread,

* Ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. In domo sua. Vulgate. And though no stress should be laid on the asperate in αὐτοῦ, still the reference of this word would be more clear and certain than in St. Mark.

Mark ii. 25, 26.

Luke vi. 3, 4.

*which is not lawful to eat,
but for the priests,*

*which is not lawful to eat,
but for the priests alone?*

AND GAVE ALSO TO THEM
THAT WERE WITH HIM?

In ST. LUKE's account part of a sentence being brought higher up [*and gave also to them that were with him*] which ST. MARK has placed at the end of the question, the whole of DAVID's action is collected together. And this arrangement of the parts of it is so natural, that ST. MARK, I think, would not have divided them, if he had written after ST. LUKE.

4. §. THE miracle done at the house of JAIRUS is told by ST. MARK and ST. LUKE with a detail of circumstances and similitude of expressions, which show that one of them followed the other rather than ST. MATTHEW. But in ST. MARK's narration there is a little difficulty, which ST. LUKE clears up by a slight transposition and change of a word or two.

ST. MARK having mentioned the message which JAIRUS received in our LORD's presence, proceeds thus :

Ch. v. 36—38. *As soon as JESUS heard the word that was spoken, he saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Be not afraid, only believe. AND HE SUFFERED NO MAN TO FOLLOW HIM, save Peter, and James, and John the brother of James. AND HE COMETH TO THE HOUSE OF THE RULER OF THE SYNAGOGUE.*

From these words it might be imagined, that our LORD stopt the people from following him, while they were on the way to JAIRUS' house ; and we are at a loss to conceive, how, without a miracle, a curious unruly multitude, that had thronged him just before, was so manageable in the open road.

But

But this little difficulty vanishes on reading ST. LUKE's account, by which it appears, that it was not on the way to the house, but at the entrance into it, that our LORD suffered no one to follow him but whom he saw proper.

Ch. viii. 50, 51. *But when JESUS heard it, he answered him, saying, Fear not, only believe, and she shall be made whole.*
AND WHEN HE WAS COME TO THE HOUSE, HE SUFFERED NO MAN TO GO IN, *save Peter, and James, and John, and the father and mother of the maiden.*

The learned reader, by consulting the original, will find also in ST. LUKE a little explanation of the office of JAIRUS. ST. MATTHEW calls him ἄρχων, *a ruler or magistrate*, which is not a very definite term; ST. MARK with more precision Ἀρχισυνάγωγος. Yet ἄρχος in composition may denote either one who presides in an assembly or occasional meeting, as Ἀρχιτρίκλινος, *ruler of a feast*, Joh. ii. 9. or one, who is the chief of any profession, as Ἀρχιερεὺς, *a chief priest*; Ἀρχιτελώνης, *a chief publican*: and a person totally unacquainted with Jewish manners might have doubted which meaning it bore in Ἀρχισυνάγωγος. ST. LUKE therefore first calls JAIRUS ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς, to determine the sense of Ἀρχισυνάγωγος, which he soon after uses with ST. MARK.

Here then again the explication improves, as the Gospels succeeded each other.

5. §. THOUGH JAIRUS was a person of some eminence, the place of his abode cannot be collected from ST. LUKE. And as it is justly observed of him, * *That he is not apt to name places*, it may be of use in the present argument to take notice of some exceptions to this remark.

When he is going to relate the calling of ST. PETER he says, that † JESUS *stood by the lake of Gennesareth*; which ex-

* Wall's Critical Notes. Luke ix. 18.

† v. 1.

plained to foreigners what the other Evangelists meant by *the sea of Galilee*.

Again, he informs us, that the miracle of feeding the five thousand was done in * *a desert place* BELONGING TO THE CITY CALLED BETHSAIDA: where ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK speak only of *a desert place*.

In the following instances of naming places he is the sole relater of the things done in them. He mentions, that the annunciation was at † *Nazareth*, a city of Galilee; the enrolment of JOSEPH and MARY at ‡ *Bethlehem, the city of David, in Judea*; the escape of our LORD from the fury of the multitude by a divine power § upon the hill on which *Nazareth* stood; || the raising of a widow's son to life at a city called *Nain*, not far from *Capernaum*; * that ten lepers were healed in a village on the confines of *Galilee* and *Samaria*; † and that ZACCHEUS, the chief of the publicans, entertained our LORD at or near *Jericho*.

Now if the specification of places is not usual with him, how comes it to be found more particularly in those passages, where ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK are explained by it, or things are related which they do not mention? In either case it was useful to deviate from his general practice; but he could not be sensible of this utility, unless he had seen their Gospels.

6. §. A PART of the opinions entertained at the court of HEROD concerning our LORD is thus represented by ST. MARK and ST. LUKE:

Mark vi. 15.

And others said, That it is a prophet, or as ONE OF THE PROPHETS.

Luke ix. 8.

And [it was said] of others, that ONE OF THE OLD PROPHETS WAS RISEN AGAIN.

* ix. 10. Compare Matth. xiv. 13. Mark vi. 32.

† i. 26.

‡ ii. 4.

§ iv. 29, 30.

|| vii. 11. Compare v. 1.

* xvii. 11.

† xix. 1—10.

One of the prophets in ST. MARK, and *one of the old prophets who was risen again* in ST. LUKE, mean the same thing. For all authoritative prophecy had ceased for an interval of four hundred years between MALACHI and JOHN the Baptist. *One of the prophets* therefore must be a prophet revived who had lived in former ages. But since this was not understood by the world in general, ST. LUKE explains the matter by a periphrasis; and he uses the same description again, when the disciples replied to a question of our LORD, *Whom say the people that I am?*

Mark viii. 28.

And they answered, John the Baptist; but some say, Elias, and others, ONE OF THE PROPHETS.

Luke ix. 19.

They answering said, John the Baptist; but some say, Elias, and others, that ONE OF THE OLD PROPHETS IS RISEN AGAIN.

7. §. Mark vi. 41, 42.

And when he had taken the five loaves and the two fishes, he looked up to heaven, and blessed, and brake the loaves, and gave [them] to his disciples to set before them; and the two fishes divided he among them all.

And they did ALL eat, and they were filled.

Luke ix. 16, 17.

When he had taken the five loaves and the two fishes, he looked up to heaven, and blessed THEM, and brake, and gave to the disciples to set before the multitude.

And they did eat, and they were ALL filled.

ST. LUKE has so disposed his words as to show more plainly, that CHRIST blessed the *fishes* as well as the *loaves*; and that *all were filled*: and this disposition is so good, that he who followed would have found no reason to change it.

8. §. Mark

8. §. Mark xi. 5.

Luke xix. 33.

And certain of them that stood there said unto them, What do ye loosing the colt ?

And as they were loosing the colt, the OWNERS thereof said unto them, Why loose ye the colt ?

ST. MARK says presently after, *And they let them go.* Which words imply indeed, that they who questioned the disciples about the colt and suffered them to lead it away, had a right to dispose of it. Yet what succeeding author would have preferred this intimation to the plain proposition of ST. LUKE, that they were *the owners of the colt ?*

9. §. Mark xii. 41—44.

Luke xxi. 1—4.

And JESUS sat over against the treasury, and beheld how the people cast money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much.

And he looked up and saw the rich men casting THEIR GIFTS into the Treasury.

And there came a certain poor widow, and she cast in two mites,

And he saw also a certain poor widow casting in thither two mites.

which make a farthing.

And he called unto him his disciples, and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, that this poor widow hath cast in more than they all which have cast into the treasury.

And he said, Of a truth I say unto you, that this poor widow hath cast in more than they all.

For all they have cast in of their abundance :

For all these have cast in of their abundance unto THE OFFERINGS OF GOD :

but she of her want hath cast in all that she had, her whole living.

but she of her want hath cast in all the living that she had.

As

DISCOURSE V. SECT. I. 137

As this incident is not related by ST. MATTHEW, it must be numbered in the list of passages, which either ST. MARK or ST. LUKE hath adopted from the other. The intent of casting money into the treasury may be collected from ST. MARK; but certainly ST. LUKE hath made it plainer to strangers, by calling the money which they cast in THEIR GIFTS, and by indicating, that this treasury was a bank which received THE OFFERINGS OF GOD.

* The reason why ST. MARK explains the value of the mite will be given in another place.

10. §. IN Ch. xiii. 24, 25. of ST. MARK the destruction of the Jewish nation and polity is foretold, as in ST. MATTHEW;

But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light; and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken.

† And the argument from the terms of the prophecy will in great measure apply to ST. MARK as well as ST. MATTHEW, and infer the same conclusion; that this figurative and symbolical stile of prediction, must have preceded the plain interpretation of it given by ST. LUKE.

11. §. Mark xiv. 54. 66, 67.

Luke xxii. 54, 55, 56.

54. *And Peter followed him afar off,*

even into the palace of the high priest; and he sat with the servants, and warmed himself at

THE BLAZE OF FIRE.

* * * * *

54. *And Peter followed afar off.*

55. *And when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the hall, and were set down together, Peter sat down among them.*

* See Sect. iv. of this Discourse.

† Disc. iv. Sect. ii. §. 8.

Mark xiv. 54. 66, 67.

Luke xxii. 54, 55, 56.

66. *And as Peter was beneath in the palace, there cometh one of the maids of the high priest :*

56. *But a certain maid beheld him as he sat by THE BLAZE OF FIRE,*

67. *And when she saw Peter warming himself, she looked on him,*

and earnestly looked upon him,

and said, And thou also wast with JESUS.

and said, This man was also with him.

I have translated the word $\Phi\omega\varsigma$, *a blaze of fire*, to distinguish it from the common word $\Pi\tilde{\upsilon}\rho$ used by ST. LUKE in verse 55, where he speaks of *the fire kindled in the midst of the hall*. He introduces $\Phi\omega\varsigma$ in the following verse, where it is more significant: for this *blaze of fire*, by which PETER sat, enabled the maid to discern, that he was a disciple of JESUS.

This meaning of $\Phi\omega\varsigma$, * though not without classical authority, is not very common; which makes it more likely, that ST. LUKE took the word from ST. MARK, and placed it to advantage.

12. §. HE has another word, for which he pretty plainly appears indebted to ST. MARK; and that is, Ἀνώγειον ; † by which name they both call the *upper-room*, where our LORD was to keep his last passover. The word is not common, and in all other places ‡ he calls such a room ὑπερῶον .

13. §. IN the following passages ST. LUKE seems to have had an eye to both ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK.

* Raphelius on Mark xiv. 54. Hutchinson's Cyropæd. p. 528. 4to.

† Mark xiv. 15. Luke xxii. 12.

‡ Acts i. 13. ix. 37. 39. xx. 8.

Matth.

Matth. xiv. 14.

*And when JESUS went forth
he saw a great multitude,
and was moved with compassion
toward them,*

Mark vi. 34.

*And when JESUS went forth
he saw a great multitude,
and was moved with compassion
toward them,
because they were as sheep not
having a shepherd:*

AND HE BEGAN TO TEACH
THEM MANY THINGS.

AND HE HEALED THEIR
SICK.

Luke ix. 11.

*And the multitude, when they knew it, followed him, and he
received them, AND SPAKE UNTO THEM OF THE KINGDOM OF
GOD, AND HEALED THEM THAT HAD NEED OF HEALING.*

Here ST. LUKE unites the two instances of CHRIST's goodness to the people; of which ST. MATTHEW had given only one, and ST. MARK the other. Again;

14. §. Matth. xxvi. 67, 68.

*Then did they spit in his face,
and buffeted him,
and others smote him
with the palms of their hands,
saying, Prophecy unto us,
thou Christ, WHO IS HE THAT
SMOTE THEE?*

Mark xiv. 65.

*And some began to spit on him,
AND TO COVER HIS FACE,
and to buffet him,
and to say unto him, Prophecy.
And the servants did strike him
with the palms of their hands.*

ST. MATTHEW leaves his readers to suppose, that the officers or servants covered our LORD's face: and ST. MARK omits to tell, *what it was that they bid him prophecy.* But ST.

LUKE, by mention of both circumstances, sets the matter in a clearer light, and compleats the narration of the two other Evangelists.

Luke xxii. 63, 64.

And the men which held JESUS mocked him and smote him, AND WHEN THEY HAD COVERED HIM, they struck him on the face, and asked him, saying, Prophecy, WHO IS HE THAT SMOTE THEE?

In all these parallels there is still some advantage of *explication* or *clearness* on the side of ST. LUKE; nor can any thing, as far as I perceive, be cast as a counterpoise into the opposite scale. Yet ST. MARK, by improving on ST. MATTHEW's expressions, shows that he would have availed himself of ST. LUKE's, had the Gospel of the latter been already published.

Two observations remain conspiring to the same end: the first of which being merely grammatical requires the originals to be quoted; the other bears reference to the reasoning in Discourse iii. Sect. iii. §. 8. on an order of history in the Gospels which is not the order of time.

15. §. Mark xii. 38—40.

Luke xx. 46, 47.

38. Βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν Θελόντων ἐν σολαῖς περιπατεῖν, καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς,

39. Καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν ταῖς δειπνοῖς.

40. Ὅι κατεαδίοντες τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χρηρῶν, καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι. Οὗτοι λήψονται περισσότερον κρίμα.

46. Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν Θελόντων περιπατεῖν ἐν σολαῖς, καὶ Φιλούντων ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς,

καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν ταῖς δειπνοῖς.

47. Ὅι κατεαδίονσι τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χρηρῶν, καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσεύχονται. Οὗτοι λήψονται περισσότερον κρίμα.

In

In strict propriety τῶν θελούντων in the beginning of ST. MARK's sentence, v. 38. required τῶν κατεσθίωντων and προσευχομένων in verse 40. And though the best Greek authors have sometimes deviated from common rules in the very same manner; yet who can think that ST. MARK wrote thus after ST. LUKE, and agreeing with him in every other respect, changed a regular into an irregular syntax? If we suppose ST. LUKE to have followed, may we not observe in him a certain delicacy with regard to ST. MARK? Ὁι κατεσθίουσι and προσεύχονται are not so visibly opposed to οἱ κατεσθiónτες and προσευχόμενοι, as τῶν κατεσθίωντων and προσευχομένων would have been, but avoid the irregularity of that construction without pointing it out, or seeming to rectify it.

16. §. CRITICS and Harmonists have observed, that where there is any difference between ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK, ST. LUKE usually accords with the latter. And this is true of him not only in particular relations, but in the general disposition of facts. And I suppose, they who have fancied, that some parts of the evangelical history are misplaced in the present copies of ST. MATTHEW, founded their conceit on the concurrence of ST. MARK and ST. LUKE in those parts. But what has been shown * in one instance is probably true in more, that they sometimes agree in placing things, not in a chronological sequence, but in another order, which they there esteemed more apt and convenient. Their agreement therefore can determine nothing concerning ST. MATTHEW, but with regard to themselves implies, that one of them was the exemplar or pattern to the other. To which of them then does probability of reason assign this character? Let one thing be assumed, which has been proved in part, and will be proved more fully in the next section, that ST. PETER directed, and in great measure dictated the Gospel of ST. MARK; and then

* Discourse iii. Sect. v. §. 7.

we may answer this question by asking, Whether it is likely that an Apostle and eye-witness of all that he dictated, was guided by the clue of ST. LUKE's Gospel rather than his own knowledge, through a train of facts which he was perpetually reviewing, and long habituated to explain? This is hardly credible; nor can we well hesitate to pronounce, that ST. PETER traced the way in ST. MARK's Gospel which ST. LUKE followed.

S E C T. II.

ST. MARK wrote his Gospel under the direction of ST. PETER.

HAVING thus endeavoured to confirm one part of the ancient testimonies concerning ST. MARK, *that he was the next Evangelist to ST. MATTHEW*; I go on to consider another, *that his Gospel was written under the direction of ST. PETER, and in great measure dictated by him.*

I. §. AND first, It appears to have been dictated by an EYE-WITNESS. * *The pillow in the hinder part of the ship, on which JESUS was asleep*; † *the green grass on which the multitude sat down to be miraculously fed*; ‡ *the rising of blind Bartimæus, and the casting away of his garment, when our LORD called him*; § *the colt tied by the door without, in a place where two ways met*; these and many other minute matters indicate, that the historian had been a spectator, who described them, because they were imprinted on his mind in seeing the action which he relates. And the distinct and particular manner in which the principal facts are generally told is a further evidence of this point.

2. §. SECONDLY, It appears to have been dictated by a GALILEAN. || HEROD the Tetrarch is here stiled a king; the

* Mark iv. 38.

† vi. 39.

‡ x. 46.

§ xi. 4.

|| Mark vi. 14. &c. See Sermon, p. 9.

lake of *Galilee*, the *sea of Galilee*: and ST. MARK, as well as ST. MATTHEW, when he speaks of crossing this lake, talks the language of the borderers on it; * *Let us pass over unto THE OTHER SIDE*. Instead of which ST. LUKE says, *Let us go unto the other side OF THE LAKE*.

3. §. THIRDLY, It was dictated by an APOSTLE. When the Apostles sent Epistles to the churches, it was often requisite to declare their character as well as name, and to show, with what commission they wrote: and on these occasions they intitle themselves APOSTLES. But in the Gospel the case was different; where CHRIST is the teacher, not they; and his authority only, not theirs, the object. Here therefore they call themselves DISCIPLES, and choose a name which set them more on a level with the other followers of their LORD. Thus ST. MATTHEW speaks constantly of them; † the place excepted, where he is to relate their appointment and names. ‡ The name of APOSTLE is found but once in ST. JOHN, and then not in its appropriate sense, in the judgement of our Translators, but as a general term. Now as ST. MARK is equally reserved in giving them this title of dignity, § which he uses only once, we esteem it a sign, that the director of his Gospel was of the same order with the Apostolical Evangelists. ST. LUKE, in whom it had been no act of humility to suppress the title which belonged to them, calls them frequently APOSTLES.

4. §. AGAIN; ST. MATTHEW, as we might expect from him, is free and ingenuous in revealing the many imperfections of the Apostles, and the reproofs which they received from CHRIST during their attendance upon him. He mentions || their slowness in apprehending our LORD's doctrine; * the

* Compare Mark iv. 35. with Luke viii. 22.

† Matth. x. 2.

‡ See the original of John xiii. 16.

§ Mark vi. 30.

|| Matth. xv. 16. xvi. 9. Compare Mark vii. 18. viii. 18.

* Matth. xv. 33. Compare Mark viii. 4.

weakness of their faith after experience of his mighty power; * the jealousies which they harboured of each other; † the want of courage shown by them in the hour of trial, when *they all forsook him and fled*, after strong protestations of adherence to him. Which several instances of their frailty are as plainly related by ST. MARK: ‡ he has even added a few not mentioned by ST. MATTHEW. But these things, which it better became themselves to confess than another to proclaim, are past over by ST. LUKE. And from hence we may conclude, that the account given of the Apostles in ST. MARK's Gospel came immediately from one of themselves, and was written by his injunction.

But to bring the matter nearer to ST. PETER. Though this Gospel was compiled by his son in CHRIST, it consults his credit and reputation less in every view, than any one of the others. The fact is evident, and I think the reason of it as plain.

5. §. SOON after the calling of ST. PETER, CHRIST was received at his house. § ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE mention it as *the house of SIMON or PETER*. But ST. MARK, that he may not seem to arrogate the flightest matter to him, calls it *the house of SIMON and ANDREW*.

6. §. WHEN the twelve Apostles were to be enumerated, it was necessary to place ST. PETER at the head of the sacred list, as is done by the other Evangelists; but it is managed in such a manner, that you scarce perceive the preference given him;

Ch. iii. 14—17. *And he ordained twelve that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach;*

* Matth. xx. 24. Compare Mark x. 41.

† Matth. xxvi. 35. Compare Mark xiv. 33.

‡ Mark vi. 52. ix. 10. x. 32.

§ Compare Matth. viii. 14. Luke iv. 38. with Mark i. 29.

and

DISCOURSE V. SECT. II. 145

and to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils. And Simon he surnamed Peter, and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James, &c.

The words of ST. MATTHEW on this occasion are ;

Ch. x. 2. *Now the names of the twelve Apostles are these ;*
THE FIRST Simon, *who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother, &c.*

All the Evangelists relate, that ST. PETER, before called SIMON, had the honour of receiving a new name from CHRIST : but ST. MARK only qualifies this honour by showing, that it was not conferred singly on him :

iii. 17. *And James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James, AND HE SURNAMED THEM BOA-
NERGES, which is, the sons of thunder.*

7. §. * HE leaves out the benediction and promises to which ST. PETER had intitled himself by the profession of his faith ; but relates at large the sharp rebuke which he presently after incurred for not bearing to hear, that CHRIST must suffer.

But with regard to ST. PETER's infirmities one general reflection may suffice : that whatever appears of that kind in the other Gospels, is faithfully recorded in ST. MARK's ; in which, as many have taken notice, less is said of his speedy repentance and bitter tears after his great fall, than by ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE.

8. §. THE name of PETER, as part of the Angel's message by the women to the disciples on the resurrection of CHRIST, is found only in this Gospel :

xvi. 7. *But go your way, tell his disciples, AND PETER, that he goeth before you into Galilee ; there shall ye see him.*

* Compare Mark viii. 28—33. with Matth. xvi. 14—23.

And this at first view may look like a distinction of honour. But I think the comment of ST. GREGORY sets the matter in a just light. * *“If the Angel had not named Peter, he had not dared to come with the DISCIPLES. His name therefore is expressly mentioned, lest his fall should make him despond.”* Thus what was consolatory and kind, was at the same time humiliating, as bearing reference to his late offence.

9. §. ON some occasions ST. PETER, with JAMES and JOHN, was chosen to accompany our LORD, in preference to the other Apostles. When he restored the daughter of JAIRUS to life; when he was transfigured on the mount; when he uttered his prophecy concerning the ruin of the Jewish state; and when he endured his agony in the garden; his only attendants were PETER and JAMES and JOHN; except that ANDREW was once with them. Of these circumstances ST. MARK makes mention, and he could not avoid it: for if his Gospel contains the testimony of ST. PETER, it was especially requisite to show, where few were witnesses of the facts related, that he was one of them. They were indeed tokens of high favour and preference, but shared by ST. PETER with some others. There were many things which tended solely to his honour; of which ST. MARK never exhibits any view.

10. §. † MR. JONES has reckoned up eight particulars of this sort, which here follow in his words:

I. “The account of CHRIST’s pronouncing PETER blessed, when he had confessed him; his declaring that he had his faith and knowledge from GOD; his promise of the keys and of that large power which is made to him, &c. are omitted by ST. MARK, though the former and succeeding

* Si angelus Petrum non nominasset, venire inter discipulos non auderet; vocatur ergo ex nomine, ne desperet ex negatione. See Whitby on this verse.

† New and full Method of settling the Canon of the New Testament, V. iii. p. 80. See also Vindication of St. Matthew’s Gospel, p. 49.

“ parts

“ parts of this Discourse are both told by him. See Matth.
 “ xvi. 16—20. compared with Mark viii. 29, 30.

II. “ The relation of ST. PETER’s being commissioned by
 “ CHRIST to work the miracle, by getting money out of the
 “ fish’s mouth to pay the tribute-money, is told by ST. MAT-
 “ THEW, chap. xvii. 24—28. but omitted by ST. MARK,
 “ though the preceding and subsequent stories are the same as
 “ in ST. MATTHEW. See Mark ix. 30—33.

III. “ CHRIST’s particular expressions of love and favour to
 “ ST. PETER, by telling him of his danger, and that he
 “ prayed particularly for him, that his faith might not fail, is
 “ omitted by ST. MARK, but related, LUKE xxii. 31, 32.

IV. “ ST. PETER’s remarkable humility above the rest of
 “ the Apostles, expressed in an unwillingness that CHRIST
 “ should wash his feet, which none of the rest did express,
 “ with CHRIST’s particular discourse to him, &c. Joh. xiii. 6.
 “ is omitted by MARK.

V. “ The instance of ST. PETER’s very great zeal for
 “ CHRIST when he was taken, in cutting off the High Priest’s
 “ servant’s ear, Joh. xviii. 10. is not mentioned by ST. MARK
 “ in particular, but only told in general of a certain person
 “ that stood by. Mark xiv. 47.

VI. “ ST. PETER’s faith in leaping into the sea to go to
 “ CHRIST, Joh. xxi. 7. is not mentioned by ST. MARK.

VII. “ CHRIST’s discourse with PETER concerning his love
 “ to him, and his particular repeated charge to him to feed his
 “ sheep, Joh. xxi. 15. is omitted by ST. MARK.

VIII. “ Our SAVIOUR’s predicting to PETER his martyr-
 “ dom, and the manner of it, Joh. xxi. 18, 19. is not related
 “ by ST. MARK.”

Thus far Mr. JONES; who justly numbers this prediction
 among ST. PETER’s honours: for nothing certainly could so
 much ennoble his active zeal and steady perseverance in the

cause of CHRIST, * as a foreknowledge of suffering and dying for it.

The list of instances given by Mr. JONES may be enlarged with a few more of the same nature, that is, where something that tended to exalt the character of ST. PETER is suppressed by ST. MARK.

IX. The calling of ST. PETER was made memorable by a wonder, which was repeated in his presence after our LORD's resurrection; who, by a draught of fishes which was symbolical as well as miraculous, thus assured him of great success in catching men with the net of the Gospel. See Luke v. 2—9. John xxi. 6—11.

X. The servants of GOD had sometimes walked through the parted waters; but no mere man do we read of in holy writ who was enabled to walk upon them, but ST. PETER. See Matth. xiv. 29.

XI. ST. PETER made another profession of his faith, besides that which † ST. MATTHEW mentions, a profession as declarative of his faith, and more demonstrative of unshaken fidelity and attachment to CHRIST.

John vi. 66—69. From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him. Then said JESUS unto the Twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, LORD, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe, and are sure, that thou art that CHRIST, the Son of the living GOD.

XII. Our LORD, on the day before his Passion, sent two of his disciples to Jerusalem to prepare the passover. On which occasion ‡ it was the office of the master of the family, or owner

* — Sciebat quæ sibi barbarus
Tortor pararet. Hor. Od. B. iii. Ode. V. v. 50.
† Matth. xv. 16—20.
‡ Maimonides in Ainsworth on Exod. xii. 7.

of the lamb, to receive it from the hands of the priests after it had been slain in the temple. Here therefore these disciples appeared and acted in their master's stead. And since it would be judged, that CHRIST deputed such to represent him at his FATHER's house as were worthiest to do it, the choice which he made of them was an honourable preference; and at the same time a token of his confidence in their faith, obedience, and care. One of the two disciples being ST. PETER, ST. MARK conceals their names.

XIII. ST. PETER was * the first of the Apostles, to whom our LORD showed himself after his resurrection. The omission of which circumstance is the more observable in ST. MARK, as he makes particular mention, in what manner MARY MAGDALENE was distinguished among the women :

Mark xvi. 9. *Now when JESUS was risen early, the first day of the week, he appeared FIRST to Mary Magdalene.*

Thus every page of this Gospel exhibits such strong and clear characters of ST. PETER's modesty and great humility, without a token appearing of ST. MARK's affection and reverence for him, and as far as could possibly be, without mention of the honours he received from CHRIST, that there can scarce be a question or doubt, who was the chief director of the work.

II. §. THE most specious objection to this conclusion arises from the difference between ST. PETER in his second Epistle and ST. MARK in his Gospel, concerning the heavenly voice heard at the Transfiguration : for it may be argued, that there could not have been any difference, if the author of the Epistle had dictated the Gospel ; whereas the account of this heavenly voice in the Epistle is,

i. 17. *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased:*

* Luke xxiv. 34. 1 Cor. xv. 5.

in

in the Gospel,

ix. 7. *This is my beloved Son, hear him.*

The whole was,

This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear him.
Matth. xvii. 5.

Now if ST. PETER in his Epistle related only so much of this sentence as his argument required, may he not have done the same thing in a concise Gospel, in which the clause, which is here left out, *In whom I am well pleased*, had been already mentioned? for it stands in the history of CHRIST's baptism.

We may see a reason, why the words, *Hear him*, omitted in the Epistle, were carefully recorded in the Gospel. They were spoken to the Apostles, just as MOSES the giver and ELIAS the restorer of the law disappeared, and signified, that CHRIST was now the legislator, who only was to be heard. If it is not so easy to discern, why the other member of the sentence, *In whom I am well pleased*, was not also recited, this one difficulty cannot subvert a conclusion drawn from such evident premises; and which is confirmed by another consideration, That ST. MARK's Gospel is solicitously restricted to those parts of the life of CHRIST, which ST. PETER had heard or seen.

12. §. * I HAVE mentioned above, that ST. MARK touches on the *Temptation* very slightly, at which ST. PETER was not present; and does not relate the discourse which passed at the *Transfiguration* while he was asleep. There is the same silence concerning the appearance of an Angel to strengthen our LORD during his agony in the garden; for then again ST. PETER, with his companions JOHN and JAMES, was sleeping, † *for sorrow*, as ST. LUKE expresses it.

* Sermon, p. 8.

† Primo cura, dein, ut agrum animum solet, somnus cepit. Sallust. Bell. Jugurth. C. lxxi. See Hom. Odyss. B. xvi. v. 450.

13. §. ST. MARK takes no notice of the miracle performed at *Nain*, where the son of a widow was raised to life, as he was carried on a bier to his burial. This miracle was done in the absence of the Apostles, as, I think, ST. LUKE plainly intimates. He says, on this occasion, that there went with CHRIST *many of his disciples*, * *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἱκανοί*, vii. 11. But he never speaks of the Apostles in this manner; and must therefore mean those other attendants of CHRIST, whom in another place he distinguishes from the Apostles, by calling them, *The company or crowd of his disciples*, ch. vi. 17.

As soon as he has told the miracle, he relates, that JOHN the Baptist sent two of his disciples with a message to CHRIST, which, as I shall endeavour to prove presently, was brought in the absence of the Apostles; next, that our LORD was invited to dine with SIMON, a Pharisee; of which the other Evangelists say nothing. He then proceeds as follows:

viii. 1. *And it came to pass afterward, that he went throughout every city and village preaching, and showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of GOD: AND THE TWELVE WERE WITH HIM.*

Why is this mentioned of CHRIST's stated attendants, but because they had been away, and were then returned to him? Their absence, when the young man of *Nain* was restored to life, was certainly possible, and is the more likely to have been really the case, because ST. MATTHEW, as well as ST. MARK, passes over this great miracle, though done in *Galilee*.

14. §. ST. MARK seems to have acted on the same principle in not relating the message of JOHN the Baptist to CHRIST, and the high testimony borne by CHRIST to the character of JOHN: of which both † ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE make

* Non Apostolos sed quosvis assiduos sectatores significat. Grot. in loc.

† Matth. xi. 2—19. Luke vii. 19—35.

particular mention. Our LORD, according to * ST. MATTHEW's connection of facts, had given his charge to the Apostles, and sent them from him to preach the Gospel, before the messengers of JOHN presented themselves to him: † and the Apostles had not yet rejoined him, when JOHN was beheaded in prison. This interval is filled up by ST. MARK with an account of JOHN's admonitions to HEROD, of the reason of his imprisonment, and the occasion and manner of his death. In which account he is more diffuse than usual, and more circumstantial than the other Evangelists. But the history of CHRIST was at a stand, and left room for a digression, till the return of ST. PETER enabled him to proceed in pursuance of his plan.

15. §. IT seems, by these examples, that he adheres, as closely as historical connection would admit, to what ST. PETER himself had *seen and heard of* THE WORD OF LIFE. Which consideration may serve to strengthen the evidence, that he wrote under the inspection of that Apostle; and at the same time to solve the question, Why he hath taken no notice of the facts contained in the first and second chapters of ST. MATTHEW. It did not come within the limits, nor consist with the nature of his work to relate them.

* Compare Matth. x. 5. with xi. 1, 2.

† Mark vi. 29, 30.

S E C T. III.

For whom ST. MARK composed his Gospel.

ST. MARK wrote his Gospel for a mixt society of Jewish and Gentile converts, with attention to the circumstances of both, and did not publish it in *Judea*.

I. §. HE follows ST. MATTHEW in several things which more nearly interested the Jews. The censures past by our LORD on their superstitious usages; on the vanity of their mere external duties, and the repugnancy of their traditions to the word of GOD * are related at large. † In another place the abuse of the indulgence granted by the Mosaic law in the matter of divorces, is reprov'd, and the nature of the marriage union declared. And ‡ because it was a question much agitated among them, *Which was the first and great commandment?* some contending for the law of sacrifices, others for that of circumcision, or the Sabbath, § a clear decision of this question is given. He records || the incident of the barren fig-tree, which was an emblem of their morals, and a type of the destruction of their city and state, and the rejection of their nation. * He dwells on the caution against false Christs and their deceivable miracles; to which illusion none were so much exposed as the Jews, who might be tempted by specious appearances to relapse into the expectation of a conquering Messias. † He sets before them the great guilt of their rulers in suborning false witnesses against our LORD in their council, ‡ and in being the inciters of the people to prefer BARABBAS to him.

* Mark vii. 3—13.

† x. 2—12.

‡ See Grotius and Whitby on Matth. xxii. 36.

§ Mark xii. 28—31.

|| xi. 12—14.

* xiii. 6. 21—23.

† xiv. 55—59.

‡ xv. 11.

These articles, either slightly or not at all mentioned by ST. LUKE, ST. MARK insists on as well as ST. MATTHEW for the admonition of the Jews.

2. §. BUT then again it appears by many instances, a few of which have been mentioned in Discourse iv. Section ix. that he considered the state of the newly converted Gentiles.

* He and ST. LUKE, in the story of the man possessed with a legion of demons, mention his address to CHRIST in these words; *What have I to do with thee, JESUS, thou Son of THE MOST HIGH GOD.* In no other part of the Gospels do we find THE MOST HIGH as an epithet to GOD: they are used separately as equivalent terms; and ST. MATTHEW in the parallel place has only, THOU SON OF GOD. Why then are they united by ST. MARK and ST. LUKE? The man and his friends were pagans; and he was constrained by an over-ruling power to confess the true GOD in this explicit manner: just as the *Pythonissa* did afterwards at *Philippi*, by saying, *These men are the servants of THE MOST HIGH GOD*, Acts xvi. 17†. And they retain the very form of words used by the demoniac for the sake of those who had believed in *gods many and lords many*, and to whom the bare name of GOD did not so surely present the proper and sublime notion of the word.

3. §. IT seems evident that the man and his friends were pagans, both from his own words and our SAVIOUR's, who often exacted a concealment of his miracles from those whom he had healed of his own nation, but commanded this man to

* Mark v. 7. Luke viii. 28. Compare Matth. viii. 29.

† *The most high God* occurs but once more in the New Testament, Heb. vii. 1. and is there taken from Gen. xiv. 18. where Melchizedec is called *The priest of the most high God*, to show, that the God whom he served was the true God, and not one of the gods of the nations. For the same reason Abraham, ib. v. 22. speaking of an oath which he had taken, *said to the king of Sodom, I have lift up mine hand to THE LORD, THE MOST HIGH GOD.* And I believe, throughout the Old Testament, THE MOST HIGH is conjoined with the name of GOD only in the like cases; unless perhaps in a place or two of the Psalms it may be rather a poetical than discriminative epithet.

return

return to his house, and show what great things GOD had done for him; that the true GOD, the GOD of ISRAEL, might be glorified among those who were strangers to him.

It was to the purpose of ST. MARK and ST. LUKE to relate an instance of CHRIST's mercy to a pagan: and the character of this man as such was more clearly shown by speaking of him only. For this reason they take no notice of another demoniac, probably a Jew, who was healed at the same time.

I think too, that the history being restricted to one case proves more distinctly, that the disorder healed was not a *natural phrensy*, but a *real possession* by evil spirits. While the man was standing single before CHRIST, ALL THE DEMONS *besought him*. So says the Evangelist; for they are his words relating a fact, not the man's uttering his own fancies. Who then are all these demons? We must suppose ST. MARK to talk a strange language indeed, and beyond all bounds of sober metaphor, if he spoke of a poor solitary lunatic as a number of demons.

4. §. HE sometimes frees the spirit of a doctrine from the restrictions of the letter. For in the economy of our redemption CHRIST on earth was to confine his ministry to the people of ISRAEL. To them he delivered his instructions, and through them to the rest of mankind. The doctrine was designed for all nations, but in some cases was clothed with a language that in the first instance bore reference to this particular people: on which occasions it now and then happens, that ST. MATTHEW gives the immediate words, the other two Evangelists, as writing on a more general plan, the ultimate sense of them. And hence a little difference of expression between him and them: as in the following * example:

* See two instances from Luke vi. 31. and xi. 42. Disc. vi. Sect. i. §. 2.

Matth. xxii. 36—40.

36. *Which is the great commandment in THE LAW?*

37. JESUS said unto him,

*Thou shalt love the LORD thy GOD with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.*38. *This is the first and great commandment.*39. *And the second is like unto it,**Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.*

40. ON THESE TWO COMMANDMENTS HANG ALL THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS.

Mark xii. 28—31.

28. *Which is the FIRST commandment OF ALL?*29. *And JESUS answered him, The first of all the commandments is,*HEAR, O ISRAEL,
THE LORD OUR GOD IS ONE LORD.30. *And,**Thou shalt love the LORD thy GOD with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength;**This is the first commandment.*31. *And the second is like, namely this,**Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.*

THERE IS NONE OTHER COMMANDMENT GREATER THAN THESE.

IN ST. MATTHEW, the question is concerning the great commandment of a particular law, and the answer corresponds to such a state of the question: but in ST. MARK, they are abstracted from a consideration of this law, and made general. The Scribe inquires, Which is the first commandment of all? and our LORD in return tells him the two leading and inseparable principles of the universal law of GOD.

ST. MARK reminded those who had been educated in polytheism of the oneness of the Godhead, by a larger quotation of the Divine Oracle; and, by showing among whom it originated,

nated, hinted to the haughty Romans, (for he published his Gospel in Italy, as will soon appear) that the instruments of conveying this first of truths to them, were a people whom they were apt despise, but to whom, HEAR, O ISRAEL, was addressed long before *Rome existed*.

By insinuating this lesson of humility, he co-operated with ST. PAUL, who found it requisite to recommend specially to the Roman church, NOT TO BE HIGH-MINDED.

5. §. THE Scribe, whose question was thus answered, made a reply, of which ST. MARK only takes notice :

32. *And the Scribe said unto him, Well, master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one GOD, and there is none other but he.*

33. *And to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices.*

34. *And when JESUS saw that he had answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of GOD.*

This speech of the Scribe which CHRIST approved, brought the unity of the Godhead again in sight. At the same time it was a lecture to the Jew not to depend on the efficacy of his animal sacrifices, and an intimation to the Gentile, that pure and spiritual religion, such as the Gospel taught, superseded the use of them.

6. §. BUT in the conclusion of ST. MARK's Gospel it is more openly signified, that the observance of legal ordinances was no longer required.

* ST. MATTHEW thus reports the words of our LORD to his Apostles :

Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the

158 DISCOURSE V. SECT. III.

name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST.

Here indeed is a silence about circumcision, as a rite of admission into the Christian church, but no clear releasement from it: for baptism might not abrogate circumcision, but be joined with it, * according to the practice of the Jews, who administred both to a proselyte from paganism. But ST. MARK having related the injunction of CHRIST to the Apostles, of preaching the Gospel to every creature, adds, † HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED SHALL BE SAVED; which in just construction is a promise of salvation without circumcision, and the ceremonies of the law.

7. §. ST. MARK appeals only twice in the whole, and only once concerning CHRIST, to the prophets of the Old Testament.

‡ First, In speaking of JOHN the Baptist, whose mission not being warranted by miracles, rested on the authority of prophecy, he cites two short passages from ISAIAH and MALACHI. § Secondly, In the history of the crucifixion he refers to the fifty third chapter of ISAIAH, *And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.* Here again it was highly expedient to call in the aid of prophecy, as it furnished an answer, which the first Christians never failed to return to the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles, when they made objections to the ignominy of the Cross, || THAT SO GOD HAD ORDAINED AND FORETOLD BY HIS PROPHETS.

* Grotius on Matth. iii. 6. Wetstein on the same.

† xvi. 15.

‡ Mark i. 2, 3.

§ xv. 28.

|| See Acts ii. 23. xvii. 3. xxvi. 23. &c. Τίς γὰρ ἂν λόγῳ ἀνθρώπου σπουδαίη ἐπακοῦσαι, ὅτι πρῶτος τῶ ἀγγέλου ἦν ἰσὶς, καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν κρίσιν τῷ πωλὶς τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ γένει ποιῆσαι, ἐν μὴ μαρτύρια πρὶν ἰλθεῖν αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον κηρυγμένα περὶ αὐτοῦ ἄκουσαι, καὶ οὕτως γενόμενα ὁρᾶμεν; Justin. Martyr. Apol. i. p. 78. Ed. Thirlby. p. 88. Ed. Paris. See also his Dial. with Trypho. p. 334. p. 317. Ed. Paris.

Origen Contra Celsum. L. i. p. 41. Ed. Cantab. 1658. 4^{to}.

Tertull. Apol. Ch. xxi. p. 20. Ed. Rigaltii, Paris. 1675. Prædixerat et ipse, ita facturos. Parum hoc, nisi et prophetæ retro.

Ruinart.

ST. LUKE has taken care to give us the same words of ISAIAH, * *And he was numbered with the transgressors*, but as mentioned by our LORD himself, and as a proof not only of GOD's decree but of CHRIST's foreknowledge. In his own person, I believe, he alleges no prophecy but that of ISAIAH relating to the Baptist.

The completion of prophecy is undoubtedly an argument to mankind in general. But the force of the argument, as it respects the MESSIAH, is the gradual and still clearer designation of him in different ages; the bearing of various shadows and figures to him as the substance; the correspondence of many types to him as the antitype; the consent of dissimilar and even opposite characters (as of humiliation and glory, servitude and royalty, death and perpetuity, manhood and divinity) in his person, as concentrating, harmonizing, and illuminating the whole. And though proofs might be adduced from detached passages of this system, yet they were most fitly urged to those, who either were read in the Law, and Prophets, and history of the Old Testament, or were apprized, that the passages alleged did, by constant tradition of the elders, and in the judgement of the most learned interpreters, relate to the MESSIAH.

Wherefore ST. MARK and ST. LUKE, when they speak in their own persons, waive the use of this great argument. They differ in this point from ST. MATTHEW, who *spoke to them that knew the Law*; I add, from ST. JOHN also, who wrote when the Gentiles were further instructed unto the kingdom of heaven: and rest the cause on the life and doctrine, the miracles and resurrection of our LORD, as yielding a convincing evidence that he was the Son of GOD; an evidence by itself satisfactory to the minds of the well-disposed, whether learned or

Ruinart. Acta Martyrum, p. 495. fol. De Phileas Martyre, Alexandriæ Antistite. Culcianus dixit, Est Deus crucifixus? Phileas respondit: Propter nostram salutem crucifixus est; et quidem sciebat, quia crucifigendus erat, et contumelias passurus, et dedit semetipsum omnia pati propter nos. Etenim sacræ Scripturæ hæc de eo prædixerant.

* xxii. 37.

unlearned, and best suited to the noviciate of the Gentile churches.

8. §. Two classes of examples have now been produced, and illustrated by comparing them with ST. MATTHEW on one hand and ST. LUKE on the other. But we must bring to the account of the latter class the explications of Jewish matters * before noted; and then I think we may conclude, that ST. MARK composed his Gospel with the comprehension with which his father in CHRIST, ST. PETER, did his first Epistle. The instructions of this Epistle, † as was observed above, are directed partly to the believing JEWS, and partly to those, *who, in time past, were not a people, but were then the people of GOD, that is, the GENTILES.* Ch. ii. 10.

S E C T. IV.

ST. MARK *published his Gospel at Rome or in Italy.*

HIS Gospel was not published in *Judea*, as may be inferred from the same explications, which had been needless in a church consisting wholly of the circumcision. There are many internal signs, confirming the testimony of the ancients, that it made its first appearance in *Italy* or at *Rome*.

1. §. AMONG these we may reckon several *Latin words*. ‡ And though Latinity had by that time made inroads into the conquered provinces, even of the Greeks, yet *Σπεκουλάτωρ* for *an executioner*, vi. 27. and *κεντυρίων* for *a centurion*, xv. 39. § seem not either then or long after to have obtained among

* Discourse iv. Sect. i.

† Discourse ii. Sect. ii. §. 6.

‡ Grotius on Luke xii. 58. 1 Cor. xvi. 17. Raphelii Annotat. in Nov. Test. V. i. p. 426. on Mark xv. 29.

§ Polybius has the word *κεντυρίων*, but with an explication of its meaning. Raphel. ib. them.

them. ST. MATTHEW, who is not averſe to Latin words, and no leſs than three times calls a *watch* or *guard* * *Κουζωδία*, yet in the place anſwering to this of ST. MARK has † *ἑκατόνταρχος* for a *centurion*; and the ſame word is retained by later writers, as JOSEPHUS and PLUTARCH. So that it is not eaſy to give a good account, why ST. MARK made choice of theſe words, but by ſuppoſing, that he thought it beſt to addreſs himſelf to the Romans in their own terms. According to GROTIUS, *οὐα, Ab! thou that deſtroyeſt the temple*, xv. 29. is no other than the Latin interjection *Vab!* and an inſtance of it in a work of ‡ ARRIAN, compoſed perhaps a century after, will not prove, that it was commonly received among the Greeks in the days of the Evangelist. But a written interjection being of very ambiguous import, except among thoſe who are accuſtomed to it, this looks again, as if he made uſe of *Vab!* where it was moſt familiar, and the force of it beſt underſtood. He explains *Lepton*, a mite, by *Quadrans*, a farthing, xii. 42. *Lepton* was the name of the loweſt coin in Greek, and *Quadrans* in Latin. As very ſmall braſs coins are ſeldom current in foreign countries, and the *Quadrans* might paſs only among the Romans themſelves, he could not properly ſay, that the poor widow put a *Quadrans* into the Treafury; he ſays therefore, that *ſhe threw in two Lepta, that is, a Quadrans*. And though this loweſt of Roman coins was worth much more than two *Lepta*, the valuation was accurate enough for the deſign of giving ſome idea of the ſmallneſs of her gift. But for whom could this valuation be intended? The Greeks did not want to be told the value of a *Lepton*; and the rating of its worth by a *Quadrans* could make it clearer to none but the Romans. Profeſſor WARD, in his LXII. *Difſertation on the Sacred Scriptures*, quotes a paſſage from the Life of CICERO by PLU-

* Matth. xxvii. 65, 66. xxviii. 11.

† xxvii. 54.

‡ Raphelius, V. i. p. 425. on Mark xv. 29.

TARCH, where it is said, § *That the Romans called their very least brass coin a QUADRANS*: which observation had been needless, if the Greeks had generally understood what a *Quadrans* was.

2. §. BUT how then came ST. MATTHEW to make use of it, v. 26. *Till thou hast paid the uttermost Quadrans?* * As a publican he was a servant of the Roman empire. His office therefore had required him to account with the general receivers in Roman coin; and both *Lepton* and *Quadrans* being names foreign to his own language, he retained that to which he had been most accustomed. From hence again we infer, *that the Greek of his Gospel was his own*. Another translating it from the Hebrew, would have taken the word that was best known to the Greeks, and have said with ST. LUKE, † *Till thou hast paid the uttermost Lepton*. Once more; ‡ in the history of the Passion, to *scourge* is called *Φραγελλῶν*. Now if ST. MATTHEW composed his Gospel first in Hebrew, he would not affect to Latinize his own tongue, but would declare the indignity suffered by CHRIST as he had predicted it, which was certainly by a Hebrew word, when he said, *They shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him*, xx. 19. And who else would think of recurring to the Latin, when his business was to turn it into Greek, if it af-

§ Life of Cicero, V. iv. p. 471. Ed. Bryan.

* The cities of Decapolis belonged to the province of Syria, [Josephus. Life. Ch. lxxv.] and were much intermixed with the tetrarchies of the Herodian family. [Plin. Nat. Hist. B. v, Ch. xvi.] Some of these cities had territories on both sides of the lake of Gennesareth, as Gadara and Hippos; which stood on the eastern side, but, as Josephus informs us, [Life, Ch. ix.] had villages on the confines of Tiberias and Scythopolis; which two cities were on the western side. The farmers therefore of the Roman customs, attentive to their own interests, and favoured by the empire, probably claimed the duties arising from the traffic of the whole lake, and had their custom houses dispersed around it. St. Matthew belonged to one of them near Capernaum. And it is not unlikely, that the Centurion mentioned, Matth. viii. 5. and Luke vii. 2. was stationed in that city (though the city was in the tetrarchy of Philip. Grot. on Matth. iv. 12.) for the protection of the publicans and their officers.

† xii. 59.

‡ Matth. xxvii. 26.

forded him a proper term? But § *μαστιγῆν* is employed for *scourging*, as a Roman punishment, both by secular authors and by the Evangelists, as || ST. JOHN in the corresponding history; and by ST. MARK, ST. LUKE, and even ST. MATTHEW, in reciting the prediction here mentioned. It seems then evident, that *φραγελλώσις* is not from the hand of a translator, but immediately of * ST. MATTHEW himself; whose intercourse with the Romans had made a word, which the Greeks did not acknowledge, familiar to him; and who being less curious in a foreign language, was disposed to employ it here, rather than *μαστιγῆν*, which he had used before, that he might relate what PILATE decreed as PILATE had expressed it.

3. §. I RETURN to ST. MARK, who, having followed ST. MATTHEW in saying † *φραγελλώσις*, then speaks of the *Prætorium* in a manner which is much to the purpose of the present question; *And the soldiers led him away into the hall, that is, the Prætorium.* *Ἀυλῇ* and *Prætorium*, as here used, were synonymous terms in Greek and Latin, ‡ and denoted the palace of a

§ See Raphelius on Luke xviii. 33.

|| John xix. 1. Mark x. 34. Luke xviii. 33. Matth. xx. 19.

* The observations, which I have incidentally made on the Greek of St. Matthew's Gospel as an original text, lying dispersed in this work, I will now in the end of them mention, to what they relate, and where they may be found. The first, Is a remark of Origen on *Ἐπίσιθ*, as a word made by the Evangelist himself. Disc. ii. Sect. ii. §. 3. The second, An observation of Eusebius, ib. in a version from the Hebrew of the Old Testament. The third, Is on *Gergesa*, as an antique name of *Gadara*, which it is more likely St. Matthew should have used, than a translator. Disc. iii. Sect. v. §. 9. The fourth, Is on another antique word, *Canaanite*, which a translator would have explained, as St. Mark has done, by *Syro-phœnician*. Disc. iv. Sect. i. §. 4. The three next are on little grammatical ambiguities, which, if the Greek of this Gospel had been written after the publishing of St. Mark's, would have been rectified by it. Disc. iv. Sect. i. §. 6. The last are the two which have been just made.—To these particular observations I must add, that the expediency of an early Gospel was argued in Disc. iii. Sect. vi. And if on a view of this expediency St. Matthew did in fact compose a Gospel early, the same expediency must induce him to publish it, if not in Greek only, yet in Greek as well as Hebrew.

† Mark xv. 15.

‡ *Νῦν δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν λέγουσιν αὐλῆς.* Athenæus ap. Grot. in Matth. xxvi. 3. Id. in Act. xxiii. 35. *Prætorium* a *prætor* Romano, id est, *imperatore* nomen habet: sed, ut fieri solet, capit proferri latius ejus vocis usus ad omnes domos virorum illustrium. Vid. eundem in Philip. i. 13. Poli Synopf. in Marc. xv. 16.

governor or great man. Now as it is beyond a doubt when he says, vii. 11. *Corban, that is, a gift.* vii. 34. *Epphatba, that is, be opened,* that he meant to interpret *Corban* and *Epphatba*; it seems as little doubtful, when he connects 'Αυλή and *Prætorium* together in the same form, (* a form often used by him for explanation) that he meant to determine the sense of 'Αυλή. The explication therefore was intended for the Latins; otherwise he would have reversed it, and instead of, *They led him away into the 'Αυλή, that is, the Prætorium,* would have said, *They led him away into the Prætorium, that is, the 'Αυλή.* Thus surely the explication would have been disposed, wherever Greek was the predominant language: which was the case in all the eastern parts of the empire, and in Egypt.

These certainly are better proofs, that he composed his Gospel at Rome, than that he composed it in Latin, † as a few authors have maintained, and that our present Greek is only a translation from his Latin text. “For what translator,” as ‡ Dr. MILL justly asks, “would have rendered the Latin “word *spiculator*” [§ or, *speculator*] “by Σπικλάτωρ, which “could so easily have been expressed in proper Greek?” A like question might be put on the calling of a *centurion*, for which there was an authorised name, Κεντυρίων. And we might further ask, Would any translator place Δεπίον and *Quadrans*, 'Αυλή and *Prætorium*, as they now stand? that is, would he interpret his own version by the language from which he made it, and not rather, as his undertaking required, explain the terms of that language by his version?

* iii. 17. Βονιερῆς ὁ ἐστὶ υἱοὶ βροντῆς.

vii. 11. Κυρῶν ὁ ἐστὶ δῶρον.

34. Ἐφφαθά ὁ ἐστὶ διανοήθητι.

xii. 42. Λιππὴ δύο ὁ ἐστὶ ποδῶν.

xv. 16. Ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς ὁ ἐστὶ περιώριον.

† Baronius, Bellarmine, Pagninus, Gaudentius, &c. See Glassii Philol. Sacre, p. 148. Pere Simon's Critical Hist. of the New Test. Part i. p. 93. English. Cornel.

a Lapide in Marc. p. 574.

‡ Prolegom. p. 13. §. cxi.

§ Grotius and Wolfius on Mark vi. 27.

The first authority alleged for this opinion is that of Pope DAMASUS, from the Life of ST. PETER in the *Liber Pontificalis*. He probably never wrote the obscure passage which they refer to, nor indeed any part of that book, but agreed with his friend ST. JEROM, who says in an Epistle to him *,
 “ That without any question the New Testament was com-
 “ posed in Greek, the Gospel of the Apostle MATTHEW
 “ excepted.”

ST. MARK attends to the Roman division of the day, in relating our LORD's prophecy to ST. PETER :

xiv. 30. *Verily, I say unto thee, that this day, EVEN IN THIS NIGHT, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice.*

The prediction was delivered before midnight, but fulfilled by ST. PETER some time after it, probably between two and three in the morning. These were parts of one and the same day in *Judea*, but not at ROME, where a new day commenced at midnight as with us. ST. MARK therefore, to explain the meaning of THIS DAY, adds, EVEN IN THIS NIGHT.

I shall mention but one argument more from a note of GROTIUS on the following passage:

Mark xv. 21. *And they compel one Simon, a Cyrenian, who passed by, coming out of the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to bear his cross.*

“ ALEXANDER and RUFUS were living when MARK wrote
 “ this account, and, if I am not deceived, at Rome where he
 “ wrote it. So that he justly appeals to their testimony, who
 “ could assure others of a fact which they had heard their father

* In Evangelistas ad Damasum Præfatio.

“ relate.

“ relate. RUFUS is saluted by PAUL among the Christians who “ dwelt at *Rome* when he wrote his Epistle to the Romans.” Ch. xvii. 13.

To this note of GROTIUS we may add, that though ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE mention SIMON the Cyrenian, they say nothing of his sons. It was not therefore merely because they were persons of note in the church, that ST. MARK was so particular about them ; for this had been a reason with ST. LUKE at least as well as him ; but because they resided in the city where he published his Gospel.

S E C T. V.

When ST. MARK published his Gospel.

AS ST. MARK's Gospel was dictated by ST. PETER, and published in *Italy*, might we not suppose him to have been there by himself, long enough to understand the state of the Roman church ; and, returning into *Asia*, to have drawn up a Gospel in conjunction with ST. PETER, which he carried to *Rome*, and there made public for the use of the church ? If the learned will not hear of such an hypothesis, as not so consonant to primitive tradition ; what is the earliest date that we can assign to this Gospel ? in other words, *When may we reasonably imagine ST. PETER to have been first at ROME ?* This is a question which would soon be answered, if it was proposed to the modern church of *Rome* ; for they maintain, that he came thither about the year of our LORD XLII. and in the first or second year of the reign of CLAUDIUS. But this is strenuously denied by learned Protestants ; who think it evident, he had never been there, when ST. PAUL wrote his Epistle to the Romans, twelve years later, according to some ; but sixteen,

teen, according to others. They further contend, That during the two years of this Apostle's confinement at *Rome*, ST. PETER was not there. However, there is an interval of three years or more, in the former part of NERO's reign, between the date of the Epistle to the Romans and the time of ST. PAUL's first appearance at *Rome*, which this reasoning does not account for. We may therefore ask the question, * with which bishop PEARSON argues against SALMASIUS, "*What hinders but that PETER may have been at ROME within the first five years of NERO?*" And we may be induced to think, that he really did go thither, if we consider the state of the Roman church and the juncture of affairs, about that time. For ST. PAUL writing to the Romans, says, Ch. i. 11. *I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift.* Which is interpreted of such a gift as an Apostle only could confer; and from thence it is concluded, that no Apostle had then been among them. But if the conclusion is just, we may subjoin as a proper corollary to it, that therefore the presence of an Apostle was much wanted by this growing church in the metropolis of the world. And since ST. PAUL himself, soon after he had declared so great desire of seeing them, was apprehended and imprisoned without prospect of a speedy releasement, in these circumstances ST. PETER might think himself powerfully called upon to supply the place of his brother Apostle, and to answer the design he had of visiting and establishing the church at *Rome*. Which he might effect; continue there a year or two, superintend the writing of ST. MARK's Gospel; and yet be departed before ST. PAUL's arrival. This first arrival of ST. PAUL at *Rome*, when he was brought prisoner thither, is placed by † Dr. CAVE in

* Opera Posthuma, Dissertat. de serie et successione primor. Romæ Episcoporum. p. 63. 4^{to}. Lond. 1688.

† Cave's Historia Literaria under the article of St. Peter.

the year of our LORD LVII, but by * bishop PEARSON and others in the year LXI. If we follow the former, we may suppose ST. MARK's Gospel to have been published about the end of the year LVI, but if the latter, about the conclusion of the year LX.

The first five years of NERO, the celebrated Quinquennium Neronis, of which bishop PEARSON speaks above, ended in October, A. D. LIX.

* Annales Paulini.

DISCOURSE THE SIXTH.

ON ST. LUKE.

S E C T. I.

ST. LUKE *wrote for the Gentile converts.*

THE third Evangelist was ST. LUKE; the internal proofs of which have been given in comparing him with ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK.

The comparison between him and ST. MATTHEW, in Disc. iv. Sect. ii. gave occasion to show by several instances, that he wrote with an especial view to the converted Gentiles. I shall now more directly consider the same point.

I. §. AND first, Let us attend to the *explications of scriptural or Jewish matters*, new to the Gentiles, which he has curiously wrought into the narration of his Gospel.

Ch. i. ver. 8—10. An account of what happened to ZACHARIAS, the father of JOHN the Baptist, is, in some degree, a description of the daily service of the Temple. The dignity and office of angels may be collected from the 19th verse; and in ver. 35th. we have a brief account of the HOLY SPIRIT; *The HOLY GHOST shall come upon thee, and the POWER OF THE HIGHEST shall overshadow thee.* The *act* of the HOLY SPIRIT here marks him as a *person*, and the TITLE ascribed to him, * THE POWER OF THE HIGHEST, is a character of di-

* See Luke xxii. 69. Acts viii. 10. and Grotius on the latter.

vinity. Further on, ver. 59. we learn, that among the Jews circumcision was administred and a name given on the eighth day after birth.

Ch. ii. ver. 23. We are told the reason of presenting their first-born male children in the Temple; and ver. 41. that the Passover was an annual feast held at *Jerusalem*.

Ch. iii. commences with an account of the governors of the several Jewish territories, at the time when JOHN began his ministry; and concludes with the genealogy of CHRIST: which, though a mere catalogue of names, opened light to the new-converted pagans, where their greatest sages were in darkness. For it suggested;

First, That GOD was the immediate creator of man; * of whose origination various sects of philosophers had formed the absurdest theories.

Secondly, as ST. PAUL taught at *Athens*, That GOD *had made of one blood all nations of the earth*. Acts xvii. 26.

Thirdly, It showed for how many generations mankind had existed: † which two last points were as obscure in the history of the Greeks, as the first, the original production of man, was in their theology. Further, it invited them to CHRIST, by a view of the fraternal connection between him and them, as having not only the same nature, but one common progenitor.

Lastly, It pointed out to them the order of birth of some illustrious persons mentioned in the subsequent parts of this Gospel, as NOAH, ABRAHAM, ISAAC, JACOB, and DAVID.

The mode of tracing out this genealogy, ‡ as a learned man has observed, is that which was most used among the

* Campbell's Necessity of Revelation, p. 320. 338.

† Censorinus de die natali. C. xx. Si origo mundi in hominum notitiam venisset inde exordium sumeremus. And again, Ch. xxi. Primum tempus [ab hominum principio ad Cataclysmum priorem] sive habuit initium sive semper fuit, certe quot annorum sit, non potest comprehendere.

‡ Genealogiam ducendi modus a Luca adhibitus gentibus magis notus erat. Surenhusii *Katachryse*, p. 115. The pedigree of Leonidas, king of Sparta, is thus traced up to Hercules. Herodotus, B. vii. C. 204. See also *Æneid*, B. vii. ver. 47—49.

Gentiles,

Gentiles, by ascending from the person whose lineage was given to the founder of his race.

We may remark in passing on, that it is probably the lineage of the blessed Virgin. It is indeed objected, "that it was" never known nor customary among the Jews to deduce the "descent of families through the female line." But this is a mistake. In the second chapter of *the first of Chronicles*, JAIR is reckoned among the posterity of JUDAH, v. 22. But because the grandfather of JAIR, v. 21. had married the daughter of MACHIR, of a noble house in the tribe of MANASSES, ib. vii. 14. therefore the same JAIR is called, Numb. xxxii. 41. The son of MANASSES. So also, Ezra ii. 61. we find a family intitled THE CHILDREN OF BARZILLAI, because one of their ancestors *took a wife of the daughters of Barzillai the Gileadite*. And * JOSEPHUS the historian mentions, in his own Life, his descent from the royal blood of the *Asmonean* family by a female, whom MATTHIAS, one of his ancestors, married. But if he designed this Life not for the Jews, but the Gentiles, so did ST. LUKE his Gospel. The objection therefore, if true, would be of no weight; since neither Greeks nor Romans had any such settled rule. † ÆNEAS in the *Æneid* speaks of himself and EVANDER as the progeny of the same ancestor, and lays a stress on the consanguinity which he deduces through females on both sides. And though this is fable, yet certainly it is fable founded on acknowledged principles: according to which, ‡ ALEXANDER the Great was con-

* Life of Josephus, §. 1.

† Dardanus, Iliacæ primus pater urbis et auctor,
Electra, ut Graii perhibent, Atlantide cretus
Advehitur Teucros: Electram maximus Atlas
Edidit, æthereos humero qui sustinet orbes.
Vobis Mercurius pater est, quem candida Maia
Cyllenæ gelido conceptum vertice fudit.
At Maïam, auditis si quicquam credimus, Atlas,
Idem Atlas generat; cæli qui sidera tollit.
Sic genus amborum scindit se sanguine ab uno.
His fretus, &c. *ÆN. L. viii. v. 134*

‡ See Plutarch. Life of Alexander, at the beginning.

sidered as an *Æacides*, or descendant of *ACHILLES* by his mother *OLYMPIAS*.

In Ch. iv. is the history of the Temptation; and here the author of evil is exhibited as one, who neither is nor pretends to be independent; ver. 6. *And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them; FOR THAT IS DELIVERED UNTO ME, and to whomsoever I will, I give it.* This lying boast of his great authority is still an acknowledgement of a Superior from whom he held it. And as *ST. LUKE* has afterwards frequent occasion to speak of *Satan*, by mentioning him in verse 8, he enables his readers to understand, who is meant by this name.

In ver. 15. of this chapter the word *SYNAGOGUE* first occurs; and the context shows, that it was a place of religious assembly on the Sabbath day, in which the Scriptures were read and explained to the people.

Here our blessed *LORD* is first introduced as a public preacher; and the nature of his office and of his gracious errand to mankind is immediately set before us in the words of *ISAIAH*.

The spirit of the LORD is upon me, because he hath ANOINTED me to PREACH THE GOSPEL to the poor: he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised. To preach the acceptable year of the LORD.

* The Greek of which passage hints the reason, why he is called *CHRIST*, and his doctrine the Gospel.

Ver. 33. The healing of a demoniac is related. † I have before noted, on whose account it stands foremost of the miraculous cures wrought by our *SAVIOUR*. For the sake of the same persons the word *DEMON*, which was equivocal among them, signifying a good as well as evil spirit, is limited to the scriptural notion by the epithet *UNCLEAN*. As it was understood in no other sense by the Jews, *ST. MATTHEW* never

* v. 18. Ὁ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔστιν ὁ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ἍΓΙΟΝ, ὅτι ἁγιασμένος ἐστίν, &c.

† See Disc. iv. Sect. v. §. 7.

uses this epithet to it. The malady is also marked with the most express characters of a real possession: to set which fact in a variety of lights, and satisfy the pagan world of the power of CHRIST over demons, ST. LUKE gives more instances of this than of any other species of his miracles.

Ch. v. 17—21. *Scribes and Pharisees* are mentioned for the first time; and to show what the Jews meant by SCRIBES, they are previously intitled * DOCTORS OF THE LAW. Some notices concerning the general character of the Pharisees are given soon after. Ver. 30. we have a specimen of their spiritual pride, in keeping men at a great distance whom they conceived to be less perfect than themselves; and another, ver. 33. in a display of their frequent fasts. Ch. vi. ver. 2. and 7. we have instances of their superstitions with regard to the Sabbath. Other instances of their usages and tenets are occasionally introduced, which prepare the reader for the severe censure cast on them by CHRIST in Ch. xi.

ST. LUKE may seem long, for his design, in speaking of the Pharisees: but other nations had their Pharisees such as he describes; in whom love of wealth and honours, superstitious zeal for a ritual law with neglect of the moral, vice under a garb of severity, conceit of wisdom or virtue, and contempt of others, were predominant. It was fit therefore, that the fatal tendency of these tempers should be known to all; and that the Gentile converts, observing how CHRIST himself had been treated in *Judea*, should be taught not to wonder, if his disciples and heavenly doctrine met with no better reception from men of similar characters among themselves.

The *Sadducees* are named only once; Ch. xx. 27. and then what was requisite is said of their opinions.

Though the sects of Pharisees and Sadducees were famous among the Jews, other nations knew little of them. ST. LUKE therefore was purposely silent about them, till he had an oppor-

* Compare ver. 17. with ver. 21.

tunity of throwing some light on their characters: as we may infer from an omission of their names in a text which otherwise closely follows ST. MATTHEW'S.

Matth. iii. 7.

Luke iii. 7.

*But when he saw many of the PHARISEES and SADDUCEES come to his baptism, * he said unto them:*

O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? &c.

Then said he to the multitude that came to be baptized of him:

O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? &c.

In Ch. ix. At the *Transfiguration* we find MOSES and ELIAS appearing in glory, and conversing with CHRIST. But we were before apprized, that MOSES was the *legislator* of the Jews, v. 14. and ELIAS their *great reformer*, i. 17. and a *prophet*, iv. 24, 25.

In ver. 52, 53. of the same chapter we have an example of the strong antipathy of the Jews and Samaritans. This document concerning the people of *Palestine* happily prepared strangers for the parable, in the next chapter, of THE MERCIFUL SAMARITAN; who would not otherwise have felt the whole force and beauty of it.

I think it evident from these instances, † without repeating others before observed, that ST. LUKE hath with equal care and address given an exposition of things new or doubtful to the Gentiles, while he seems only to be carrying on the course of his narration.

* *He said unto them*] That is, not only to the Pharisees and Sadducees, but also to the multitude described, v. 5. as flocking to his baptism. St. Luke authorizes this interpretation of St. Matthew. See Raphelius on Matth. iii. 7. p. 188.

† See Disc. iv. Sect. ii. on Luke vii. 28. xi. 44. on ch. xxi. xxii. 69. xxiv. 44, 45, &c.

2. §. He appears to have omitted several things with an eye to the same class of readers ; as,

1st. *An appeal to the Mosaic law.*

This will be best seen by opposing his text to ST. MATTHEW'S:

Math. vii. 12.

Luke vi. 31.

Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them :

And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.

FOR THIS IS THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS.

Matth. xxiii. 23.

Luke xi. 42.

Ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cumin, and have omitted THE WEIGHTIER MATTERS OF THE LAW, judgement, mercy, and faith.

Ye tithe mint and rue and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgement and the love of God.

As these passages stand in ST. MATTHEW, we find the Jew instructed or judged from the Law ; but in ST. LUKE the matter rests on the sole authority of CHRIST. None greater could be urged, and none so fitly urged to the Gentiles, till they had learned to separate between the parts of the Law from which they were free, and to which they owed obedience.

2dly. *A typical allusion to the History of the Old Testament.*

Our LORD had mentioned *the sign of the prophet JONAS* ; first, As prefiguring his own death and resurrection on the third day ; and secondly, As a warning to the Jews who stood condemned

176 DISCOURSE VI. SECT. I.

demned by the conversion of the Ninevites. *The sign of JONAS* seems most important in the first view; but to understand it required a knowledge of his history. ST. LUKE therefore mentions it only in the second, which his context explains. Luke xi. 30. Compare Matth. xii. 40.

3dly. *A circumstance not so interesting to them.*

ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK inform us, that our LORD spake the prophecy of the fall of *Jerusalem* and the Jewish state on *the Mount of Olives*. And it is no wonder, that ST. MATTHEW points out the place where he sat to open this scene of things to come; or that ST. MARK, the amanuensis of ST. PETER who was present, is yet more circumstantial, and adds, that *He sat over against the Temple*. The early Jewish believers, whom devotion led to the places which CHRIST had frequented, arriving at this spot, would meet the thought of his awful prediction in the prospect of the city, and splendor and magnificence of the temple; for * *Olivet* commanded both. But to strangers of the Gentiles, who did not know how the mount and city stood, and were not likely to visit either, this circumstance was not of such moment; and accordingly ST. LUKE makes no mention of it. See Ch. xxi. 7, 8. and compare Matth. xxiv. 3, 4. Mark xiii. 3, 4.

4thly. *The prophecies of the Old Testament which apply to CHRIST.*

This has been shown in the preceding Discourse, Sect. iii. on ST. MARK.

3. §. HE introduces many things unnoted by the other Evangelists, which encouraged the Gentiles to hearken to the

* Ex hoc loco Hierosolyma tota oculis objicitur, ut situs, forma, ædificia, ambitus totus, et quæque ejusdem partes distinctè ac particulariter internosci queant, præsertim mons Moriah, et Solomonis templum, ejusque area spatiosa. Cotovici Itinerarium. p. 265.

Gospel,

Gospel, and, when their consciences were awakened by it, to turn to God in newness of life with a pleasing prospect of pardon and acceptance.

* The parable of the publican praying in the temple; † the parable of the lost piece of silver (subjoined to that of the lost sheep, which he tells more at large than ST. MATTHEW); the parable in the same chapter of the prodigal son returning; ‡ the visit of CHRIST to ZACCHEUS the publican; § and the pardon of the penitent thief on the cross, are lively illustrations or examples of the benignity and goodness of God to repenting sinners.

And lest doubts should arise, whether any but the lost sheep of the house of ISRAEL were interested in these things, others are intermixt with them which cannot be so limited. || He recites a parable in praise of a merciful Samaritan; * he relates, that another Samaritan was healed of his leprosy, and commended for his faithful gratitude; and when a village of this people proved rude and inhospitable, that the zeal of the two Apostles who wished to consume them by fire from heaven was reprov'd; and they were told, that *The Son of man came not to destroy mens lives, but to save them.*

He has examples also of kindness and mercy shown to the Gentiles. † Our LORD himself, in the first public discourse mentioned in this Gospel, takes notice, that such favours were vouchsafed to the widow of *Sarepta*, and NAAMAN the Syrian, both Gentiles, as were not done for any in like circumstances of the people of ISRAEL. ‡ And the prayer upon the Cross, FATHER, *forgive them, for they know not what they do*, is placed between the act of crucifying our LORD, and that of parting his raiment, which were both acts of the Roman soldiers: whom therefore this prayer must respect as much as any of his persecutors.

* xviii. 10.
|| x. 33.

† xv. 8—10.
* xvii. 19.

† xix. 5.
† iv. 25—27.

§ xxiii. 40—43.
† xxiii. 34.

4. §. LET it be observed, how carefully and frequently ST. LUKE inculcates the duties of prayer and thanksgiving.

The admonition to pray always, xviii. 1. is repeated xxi 36. Two parables which show the success of frequent and fervent prayer, xi. 5. xviii. 2. occur only in his Gospel: and so likewise several instances of the practice of CHRIST, as at his baptism, iii. 21. before he made choice of his Apostles, vi. 12. before he publicly declared to them, that he should be put to death, and rise again the third day, ix. 18—22. and at his Transfiguration, ix. 29. On which occasions ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK leave us to conclude as a thing of course, that our LORD was employed in prayer; but ST. LUKE is explicit concerning his devotions.

There are also a dozen instances of praising, blessing, or glorifying GOD mentioned only by him. With these he begins early, and with an example of this kind he finishes.

Now certainly the adopted alien wanted to be taught these things and reminded of them, much more than the native Israelite trained up in the discipline of the temple. When therefore we find ST. LUKE acting as ST. PAUL did to the churches of the Gentiles, it is not unreasonable to believe, that he had the same sort of converts more immediately in view. ST. PAUL, in writing to the Hebrews, does not so much exhort Them to prayer and thanksgiving, * as to the offering up of these spiritual sacrifices by a new and living way, through the Mediator of the new covenant: but he earnestly recommends these duties to the † Romans, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, and the Thessalonians.

5. §. FOR a like reason ST. LUKE seems more solicitous than the other Evangelists, to instil just notions concerning the soul, and its state after death.

* Heb. x. 19—22. xiii. 10—15.

† See Rom. xii. 12. Eph. vi. 18. Philip. iv. 6. Col. iv. 2. 1 Thess. v. 17.

When

When he relates, ch. viii. that CHRIST restored the daughter of JAIRUS to life, he adds, ver. 55. that *Her spirit came again*. Upon which GROTIUS remarks, "That this was providentially added by ST. LUKE to the account of the other Evangelists, as an intimation, that the human soul is not a temperament of the body, or any thing that dies with it, but somewhat subsisting by itself; which, after the conclusion of this mortal life, is not in the same place with the body: for this is taught in saying, *It came again*."

Ch. xvi. 9. we have these words of CHRIST;

I say unto you, make to yourselves friends of the Mammon of unrighteousness; that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations.

Our LORD in this and the following verses was cautioning his hearers against the love and abuse of riches; in which being interrupted by the scorn of the Pharisees, he turned his discourse to them for a while, and having reprov'd them for hypocrisy and false pretences to sanctity, for disregard of the new and gracious dispensation of Heaven to returning sinners (which began with the preaching of JOHN, and being witnessed by the law and prophets must have a full accomplishment), and for taking unjust advantages of the Mosaic institution, for which they made show of such zeal, to the gratifying of their lusts; he then resumed the former subject, and enforced it by an example, which shows the sad consequence of riches misapplied, and, with a reference to this verse in particular, points out, who are the friends that receive the faithful *into everlasting habitations*, and at what time they are thus befriended; it is, *when they fail*, that is, as soon as they die; for this is the natural and obvious meaning of the expression; the meaning that is illustrated by the case of LAZARUS.

The story of the rich man and LAZARUS is indeed a parable. But there is a wide difference between *Æsopic* fables, or such apologues as that of JOTHAM, and the parables of CHRIST. We find in these no imaginary beings introduced for the sake of a moral, but a perfect analogy throughout to nature and life. On such a principle all his other parables proceed. And till it is shown, why this singly should be composed on a plan of less dignity and gravity, we must believe it to be of a piece with the rest; that with only so much embellishment as was necessary in building it up, it is grounded on the real constitution of things. But both superstructure and foundation are as ideal as the conference of the trees about choosing a king, unless it is true, that departed souls in their several mansions are sensible of happiness or misery.

Which doctrine is made still clearer by * the history of the penitent thief on the cross. His request to CHRIST was, LORD *remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom*: and all that he asked had been liberally granted, if our LORD had answered, *Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt be with me in paradise*. But his answer is, *Verily I say unto thee, TO-DAY thou shalt be with me in paradise*. † What then is the import of TO-DAY but to crown the grant with an assurance of immediate bliss?

Some would join TO-DAY with the preceding words, and read, *Verily I say unto thee to-day, Thou shalt be with me in paradise*. * This GROTIUS notes as a very bad interpretation: and there is a difficulty attending it, which as yet I have not seen surmounted, of giving the word any tolerable force, and making the sense better with it, than if it was away. Besides which, ST. LUKE is made to express himself in a matter of moment with an ambiguity, which he could so easily have avoided by

* xxiii. 40—43.

† Latroni mox oranti, ut in regno cælesti non gravaretur sui vel meminisse, paradysum eo die se præstiturum, quam non fuerat rogatus, pollicetur. Tatian. See Lardner's Credib. Vol. iii. p. 149.

‡ Pessime fecerunt qui hanc vocem aut cum λίζω conjunxerunt, quod aperte improbat Syrus, aut interpretati sunt Σήμερον post resurrectionem. Grot. in loc.

inserting the particle *ὅτι*; * which is no more improper after *λέγω* in Greek, than THAT, is after, I SAY, in English. The sentence thus qualified would have been perfectly clear: *Verily I say unto thee to-day, THAT thou shalt be with me in paradise.* As ST. LUKE has not done this, I conclude he meant the words to be connected, as the form of the sentence leads us to connect them.

TO-DAY then being left to its proper and natural coherence, the speech of CHRIST is resolvable into two propositions, *TO-DAY I shall be in paradise*, and, *TO-DAY thou also shalt be there.* But if the gates of paradise were to be opened to the blessed Soul of CHRIST, as soon as it was released from the body, but shut against this penitent lying insensible, till the last trumpet shall sound; TO-DAY is plainly used with a surprising latitude, and in two senses; one of which is so figurative and disproportioned to the other, that it is hard to believe, it was designed.

Nor would it mend the matter to suppose, that TO-DAY is extended beyond its strict meaning with regard even to CHRIST: for that he himself did not enter paradise, if paradise is heaven, till after his resurrection. This will bring the two acceptations of the word very little nearer together. There is still so immense a disparity and distance between them, as the man could not possibly conceive in hearing, nor therefore the gracious speaker intend in saying, TO-DAY. For, † as one hath observed on another occasion, “There is no sophistry in the “divine promises.”

Thus a plain convert of the Gentiles might reason on the case, without knowing the distinction, ‡ which the ancients of the Jewish first, and then of the Christian church, made between *paradise* and *heaven*; and to which distinction ST. PAUL gives countenance, 2 Cor. xii. 2. 4. where he tells, that *He*

* See the Greek of Matth. vi. 5. Where the best copies read, *Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀπύχου τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν.*

† Dean Young's Sermons, V. i. p. 438.

‡ See the learned and excellent note of Grotius on this verse of St. Luke.

was caught up to the THIRD HEAVEN; * and again, that *He was caught up to PARADISE*. He was caught up to the THIRD HEAVEN, that he might contemplate that scene of supreme felicity which awaits the just after the resurrection; and he was caught up to PARADISE, that his mind might be contented with a view of their nearer consolations.

This is the exposition of GROTIUS; and it seems well founded: for ST. PAUL plainly speaks of two extatic visions, and of two places to which he was transported. Now HEAVEN being the seat of the blessed after the resurrection, according to the doctrine of the New Testament; when can they repose in PARADISE; as by this place of ST. LUKE we find they do, but in the intermediate state?

But by whatever name we call the place of their rest, ST. LUKE elsewhere shows, that *They live to God*, xx. 38. which necessarily includes the notion of real and immediate life, as appears by the same expression in ST. PAUL, Rom. vi. 10. and that they enjoy a degree of glory: for at the Transfiguration, both MOSES and ELIAS appeared in glory, Luke ix. 31. MOSES who died and was buried, Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6. as well as ELIAS who was translated.

Such then is the doctrine which ST. LUKE is careful to inculcate concerning the state of the soul after death; a doctrine greatly wanted by those, whose minds had been possessed with the fables of their poets, or perplexed with the doubts of their philosophers.

* Δύο ἀποκαλύψεις μεγάλης ἐμφανείας μνηύει, δις ἀνεληφθεὶς ἐν αἰθέρι. Methodius apud Photium, See Lardner's Credib. V, v. p. 269.

S E C T. II.

Where ST. LUKE published his Gospel.

1. §. IT appears, that ST. LUKE designed his Gospel for the Gentiles: and the author's character as well as the nature of the work will not suffer us to think, that he published it in *Judea*, where an Apostle had written one before him. There are several signs of the contrary, besides the explications of Jewish matters already noted.

ST. MATTHEW, speaking of the Passover, says, *Ye know that after two days is THE PASSOVER*, xxvi. 2. This was the proper stile for *Judea*. Yet ST. LUKE says, *Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh*, WHICH IS CALLED THE PASSOVER, xxii. 1.

He relates, xxi. 37. that CHRIST went out and abode IN THE MOUNT WHICH IS CALLED THE MOUNT OF OLIVES. Both he and * JOSEPHUS might express themselves in that manner among the Greeks or Romans, but to have done it in *Judea*, where *Olivet* had been long famous, would have sounded almost as strange, as to have talked of THE CITY WHICH IS CALLED JERUSALEM. Again, xxiii. 51. He calls *Arimathea*, where JOSEPH dwelt who begged the body of JESUS, A CITY OF THE JEWS. And this I esteem another manifest sign, that he did not write in Jewish territories; in which he would have used a more distinguishing title, that might mark the province to which *Arimathea* belonged, or no title at all.

2. §. SOME few of the ancients supposed him to have written at *Alexandria* in *Egypt*. But this opinion does not suit perfectly with the form in which he puts our SAVIOUR's words to ST. PETER, xxii. 34. *The cock shall not crow THIS DAY before that thou shalt thrice deny, that thou knowest me.* As midnight

* Jewish War. B. v. C. ii. §. 3.

intervened

intervened between the prediction and the completion, the words were spoken in one day and fulfilled in another, * according to the Egyptian division of days, which was the same with the Roman. Had he therefore written in *Egypt*, probably he would have determined the sense of THIS DAY, as ST. MARK has in writing at ROME, Mark xiv. 30. *This day, even IN THIS NIGHT, before the cock crow twice thou shalt deny me thrice.*

Again he says, xxiii. 54. *And that day was the preparation AND THE SABBATH DREW ON.* Where a new day began at sunset, these words accurately described the intended time of the evening; but where it commenced at midnight, the description did not clearly convey its meaning to an unlearned reader. In such a place there had been the same reason as before, to follow ST. MARK, who says in direct terms, xv. 42. *WHEN THE EVEN WAS COME.*

3. §. THE more considerable authorities are in favour of *Achaia*. Whether the following observations are of any weight on the side of this opinion, the reader must judge.

ST. LUKE does not intermix foreign words, proper names excepted, like the other Evangelists. † ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK call the tax paid to the Romans *Κῆνος*: which was indeed the precise name of it, yet he substitutes a Greek word [*Φόρος*] for it. ‡ In relating that the soldiers *compelled* SIMON the Cyrenian to bear the cross, they say with great propriety, *Ἀγγαρεύσαι*. He had the same occasion to say so too, but does not; the word being formed from the Persian by the Asiatic Greeks, and, § though it might be understood, not perhaps received in *Achaia*. RABBI, so common in the other Gospels, is never found in his. || The acclamation of HOSANNA to

* Sacerdotes Romani, et qui diem diffiniere civilem, item Ægyptii et Hipparchus, a media nocte in mediam. Plin. Hist. Nat. L. ii. C. lxxix. Ed. Hardouin.

† Compare Matth. xxii. 17. Mark xii. 14. with Luke xx. 22.

‡ Compare Matth. xxvii. 32. Mark xv. 21. with Luke xxiii. 26.

§ See Herodotus, B. viii. C. 98.

|| Compare Matth. xxi. 9. Mark xi. 9. with Luke xix. 38.

CHRIST,

CHRIST, * and his address on the Cross to his heavenly FATHER, ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACTHANI are omitted. We read in ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK, *When they were come to a place called GOLGOTHA, that is to say, a place of a SCULL.* But he leaves out GOLGOTHA, and turns the meaning of it into a proper name, Κρανίον, which we translate, following the Latin, *When they were come to a place which is called CALVARY.* His reserve in which instances may with probability be attributed to a desire of not giving offence, where it was not necessary, to the delicacy of the Greeks who accounted the words barbarous.

4. §. HE gives the Greek the precedence of the Hebrew and Latin, when he has occasion to mention them together, xxiii. 38. *And a superscription also was written over him, in letters of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew.* This seems a precedence by the courtesy of the Evangelist: for ST. JOHN names the Hebrew first.

The Evangelists all mention this superscription; but every one of them with some difference, except in the last words, THE KING OF THE JEWS; which † a late learned author urged as “a want of accuracy and exactness of truth.” The criticism were of little moment, if the ground on which he raises it were sure; that there was one form of inscription in the three languages. But what if it varied in each? The supposition being as admissible as the contrary, let me be indulged in a digression on the probability of it.

We may reasonably suppose ST. MATTHEW to have recited the Hebrew;

THIS IS
JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS.

* Compare Matth. xxvii. 46. Mark xv. 34.

† Dr. Middleton.

And St. JOHN the Greek ;

JESUS THE NAZARENE THE KING OF THE JEWS.

If it should be asked, Why THE NAZARENE was omitted in the Hebrew, and we must assign a reason for PILATE's humour ; perhaps we may thus account for it. He might be informed, that * JESUS in Hebrew denoted A SAVIOUR ; and as it carried more appearance of such an appellative or general term by standing alone, he might choose by dropping the epithet THE NAZARENE to leave the sense so ambiguous that it might be thus understood ;

THIS IS
A SAVIOUR THE KING OF THE JEWS.

PILATE, as little satisfied with the Jews as with himself on that day, meant the inscription, which was his own, as a dishonour to the nation ; and thus set a momentous verity before them, with as much design of declaring it, as CAIAPHAS had of prophesying, † THAT JESUS SHOULD DIE FOR THE PEOPLE. The ambiguity not holding in Greek, THE NAZARENE might be there inserted in scorn again of the Jews, by denominating their king from ‡ a city which they held in the utmost contempt.

Let us now view the Latin. It is not assuming much to suppose, that PILATE would not concern himself with Hebrew names, nor risk an impropriety in speaking or writing them. § It was thought essential to the dignity of a Roman magistrate in the times of the republic not to speak but in Latin on public occasions. || Of which spirit TIBERIUS the emperor retained so much, that in an oration to the senate he apologized for using a Greek word ; and once, when they were

* Pearson on the Creed, Art. ii. *at the beginning.*

† John xi. 49—51.

‡ John i. 46.

§ Valerius Maximus, B. ii. C. ii. §. 2.

|| Sueton. in Tiberio. C. 71. The two words were *Monopoly* and *Emblem*.

drawing

drawing up a decree, advised them to erase another that had been inserted in it. And though the magistrates in general were then become more condescending to the Greeks, they retained this point of state with regard to other nations, whose languages they esteemed barbarous, and would give themselves no trouble of acquiring. PILATE indeed, according to ST. MATTHEW, asked at our LORD's trial, *Whom will ye that I release unto you, Barabbas, or JESUS which is called CHRIST?* And again, *What shall I do then with JESUS which is called CHRIST?* But I judge this to be related as * the interpreter by whom he spake delivered it in Hebrew. For if the other Evangelists have given his exact words, he never pronounced the name of JESUS, but spake of him all along by a periphrasis; *Will ye that I release unto you THE KING OF THE JEWS? What will ye then, that I shall do unto him whom ye call THE KING OF THE JEWS?* Thus he acted in conference with the rulers, and then ordered a Latin inscription without mixture of foreign words, just as ST. MARK repeats it;

THE KING OF THE JEWS.

Which is followed by ST. LUKE; only that he has brought down THIS is from above, as having a common reference to what stood under it:

THIS IS
THE KING OF THE JEWS.

It is very possible, that a better account may be given of the three forms of the inscription; but I think I am well founded in asserting, that there were variations in it, and that the shortest was the Latin.

5. §. To return to ST. LUKE. The remark, that he does not intermix foreign words, is not without exceptions. He

* See Wolfius on Matth. xxvii. 2.

has AMEN, MAMMON, and GEHENNA. But it was necessary to retain them.

* AMEN is a word with which our LORD prefaced his solemn declarations, in a stile proper to the Son of GOD. The saints use it in supplication, or in assenting to the word of GOD: but no Prophet or Apostle ever said, AMEN, I SAY UNTO YOU. This use of AMEN is left to GOD and CHRIST; for it is the language of Him who avers by HIMSELF. It was therefore to be kept in those places, where the Greek had no term to express the peculiar solemnity of it.

MAMMON, or MAMMÔNA, as he writes it, is found in ch. xvi. and three times in the compass of five verses. Which reiteration of a word that was harsh to the ears of a Grecian would induce one to think, that he wished to make the sound excite an aversion for the thing. But whether he repeated it with this view or not, he had a good reason for employing it. For if MAMMON meant only riches, yet in the sentence, *Ye cannot serve GOD and MAMMON*, it is by a figure made a person and opposed to GOD: in which case it was preferable to the Greek word PLUTUS. Because PLUTUS signified not only riches, but the god of riches, and might here seem to countenance a notion of the people, that such a being existed.

GEHENNA is another Hebrew word found once in his Gospel, xii. 5. But TARTARUS, the Greek term for hell, had so many fabulous ideas associated with it, as to render it improper in speaking to converts from paganism.

* Τὸ Ἀμήν passim quidem a sanctis usurpatur quum optant, sed non quum asseverant. Nemo unquam prophetarum aut Apostolorum dixit, *Amen, Dico vobis*. Seli Deo Christoque hoc relinquitur, quia ejus est qui per seipsum asseverat. Ludovicus De Dieu in Pole's Synopsis, on Matth. v. 18. The learned *Nicolas Fuller*, Miscell. Theol. B. i. C. 2. endeavours to prove, that Ἀμήν signifies no more than Ἀληθής, or Ναί. These words might sometimes answer the same purpose, but his arguments seem not to disprove the observation of *De Dieu*. Our blessed Lord, in the Sermon on the Mount, enjoins the use of Ναί to his followers, but uses Ἀμήν himself in the same discourse. Compare Matth. v. ver. 37. with ver. 18. and 26. And we may justly conclude from St. Matthew's account, that the Hebrew word answering to Ναί, in ver. 37. was different from Ἀμήν.

6. §. I THINK we see an instance of his caution on this head in the history of the Transfiguration. * ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK say, that our LORD WAS TRANSFIGURED, μεταμορφώθη; ST. LUKE, that THE FASHION OF HIS COUNTEenance WAS ALTERED. Did he not express himself thus differently from them, that he might avoid the literal use of a term which entered into so many fictions of the Greeks? It is well known how much they abounded with stories of transmutations of form; which they not only reported but believed, if the censure is just which † PLINY passes on them, “That the credulity of the Greeks is surprising.” He is speaking more particularly of the Arcadians, who inhabited a part of *Achaia*. If this observation will hold, the first object of ST. LUKE’S caution were the Achaians.

7. §. AND on the foot of his reserve in using Hebrew words, the question, whom he studied not to offend, Whether the Greeks of *Achaia* or *Alexandria*, is easy to decide. *Alexandria* was planted by ALEXANDER the Great with a colony of Macedonians mixt with native and Persian Egyptians; and Hebrews. His countrymen talked the language neither of *Attica* nor *Achaia*. They brought with them ‡ a different idiom, which was probably the ground of that which is now called Hellenistic: and their posterity became § Egyptians in features, complexion, and tone of voice. No such management therefore was required with regard to a people of this character, as might be expedient in indifferent matters towards the inhabitants of *Greece*; who || “had a childish antipathy to every fo-

* Compare Matth. xvii. 2. Mark ix. 2. Luke ix. 29.

† Mirum est quo procedat Græca credulitas: Nat. Hist. B. viii. C. xxxiv.

‡ Quint. Curtius, B. vi. C. ix. and n. 53. of the notes of Pitiscus. See some instances of the Hellenistic language in *Chishull’s* Remarks on the Monumentum Adulitanum, p. 86. note 16. See also Mr. *Bowyer’s* Preface to his Conjectures on the New Testament, p. 26.

§ See Lucian’s Πλοῖον ἢ Εὐχαι, p. 931. Ed. Paris. fol. 1615. cited by Mr. *Bryant*, Observations and Enquiries &c. p. 19.

|| Id. Analysis of Ancient Mythology, V. i. p. 167.

“ reign

“ reign language ; and were equally prejudiced in favour of
 “ their own.—They were misled by the too great delicacy of
 “ their ear ; and could not bear any term which appeared to
 “ them barbarous and uncouth.”

8. §. IT was said of ST. LUKE by the ancients, “ That he
 “ taught the Gospel which PAUL preached ;” and critics re-
 mark, that there is often a great affinity in their phrases : of
 which the account given by them of the institution of the
 LORD’S Supper has been frequently brought as an example. A
 sentence is quoted as Scripture, 1 Tim. v. 18. *The labourer is
 worthy of his reward*, which we no where meet with precisely
 in these words, except Luke x. 7. The language of the pre-
 cept in the next verse, *Eat such things as are set before you*, is
 the same with that in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, x. 27.
Whatsoever is set before you eat. Another instance of agreement
 in language is produced by GROTIUS on Luke xxi. 34. com-
 pared with 1 Theff. v. 3. And some words which are common
 to ST. PAUL and ST. LUKE, either do not occur in other
 writers of the New Testament, or not in the same sense. Two
 such * at least, *παρακολουθῶ*, in the notion of *understanding per-
 fectly*, and *κατηχῶ* in that of *instructing by word of mouth*, ap-
 pear in the very outset of ST. LUKE’S Gospel.

But the ancients, I presume, said this of him in a higher
 sense, than that he followed his master’s diction ; and meant,
 that he drew the knowledge he had of evangelical facts as well
 as doctrines in the first instance from the sources of ST. PAUL’S
 illumination ; which opinion receives some countenance from
 the manner in which he speaks of himself in his Preface : of
 which notice will be presently taken.

* *παραφορεῖσθαι*, another word of ST. LUKE and ST. PAUL, has probably the same
 meaning, Luke i. 1. and 2 Tim. iv. 17.

S E C T. III.

Review of the argument concerning the order of the Gospels.

1. §. THE argument concerning the order of three of the Gospels being now finished, let us take a summary review of it.

It was concluded in Discourse iii. Sect. v. from the comparisons and reasonings of the three former sections, THAT THE EVANGELISTS IN SUCCESSION HAD SEEN EACH ANTECEDENT GOSPEL. And though the conclusion, from instances of their great agreement, rested on solid grounds, as it then stood; yet the course of future comparisons yielded fresh examples of this agreement: and when the peculiar design of each Gospel was seen, we were furnished with principles of accounting for little variations; which are generally such, as an Evangelist would be led to make by the very nature of his plan, though he wrote with another Gospel before him, and meant to follow it. Thus the premises were strengthened by a supply of similar examples, and the inference guarded against exception from the differences found in some of them. And as a peculiarity of stile and manner, as well as of design, is visible in the general tenor of the several Gospels, the argument from their entire concurrence in particular places is the more conclusive.

For the purpose of determining their order, three positions were established in Discourse iii. Sect. vi. and it was inferred, chiefly though not solely, from them, in Discourse iv. Sect. i. and ii. THAT ST. MATTHEW PUBLISHED A GOSPEL BEFORE ST. MARK AND ST. LUKE.

This was further evinced by showing;

First, In Discourse iv. Sect. iii. from considerations which
stand

stand by themselves, without leaning on any previous hypothesis, THAT HE WROTE VERY EARLY.

Secondly, In the same Discourse, Sect. v. by more direct evidence than had hitherto been given, THAT HE WROTE FOR THE HEBREWS AND IN JUDEA.

The order of ST. MARK and ST. LUKE came next under examination. And though it appears, that * ST. MARK did not publish his Gospel very soon, yet his priority to ST. LUKE was determined in Discourse v. Sect. i. chiefly by comparing them with regard to PERSPICUITY and EXPLANATION; to which both being attentive, we might reasonably conclude, that He in whom these virtues of narration are most perfect, was the later writer.

And we may consider this matter as confirmed in the first part of Discourse vi. by other examples of ST. LUKE's great attention to the article of explaining.

P. 74. Some of the facts to which the three positions of Discourse iii. Sect. vi. apply, are further ascertained in places subsequent to Discourse iv. and add weight to the preceding arguments, THAT ST. MATTHEW WAS THE FIRST OF THE EVANGELISTS. For it is confirmed in Discourse v. Sect. iii. THAT ST. MARK DID NOT WRITE SIMPLY FOR THE HEBREWS; in Discourse vi. Sect. i. THAT ST. LUKE WROTE ESPECIALLY FOR THE GENTILES; and in the two same Discourses, THAT BOTH PUBLISHED THEIR GOSPELS AT A DISTANCE FROM JUDEA. It hath been shown also in repeated instances, THAT THEY SO EXPRESS THEMSELVES, AS TO ENLARGE THE SENSE OF PRECEPTS OR DOCTRINES, WHICH THE LETTER OF ST. MATTHEW SEEMS TO CONFINE TO THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL.

In treating the several questions of these Discourses, if some arguments are set down which appear of small value singly, yet the collective sum of them, with the aids which different parts

* See Mark xvi. 20. and the conclusion of Disc. iv. Sect. iv.

reciprocally

DISCOURSE VI. SECT. IV. 193

reciprocally lend to each other, amounts, I conceive, to a proof which may be deemed a moral certainty, that the order of the Gospels, and the main of the articles here asserted are true.

2. §. THE progress in planting the Christian faith was from a church purely Jewish to a mixt community, and from thence to distinct churches of the Gentiles. And there is a strong presumption, that the Gospels were published successively, as they were wanted by the churches to whose use they were immediately adapted. But ST. MATTHEW wrote for the first, ST. MARK for the second, and ST. LUKE for the third settlement of the faith. This view of things therefore presents us with the order in which the Gospels have all along been disposed, and which I have endeavoured to establish.

Some objections which nearly affect a great part of the reasoning on this subject shall next be considered.

S E C T. IV.

Observations on ST. LUKE's Preface.

1. §. THE learned moderns who contend, that the Gospels of ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK were either not extant or not known to ST. LUKE when he wrote, lay great stress on the PREFACE to his Gospel, which they esteem decisive in their favour. They argue from it, That ST. LUKE takes no notice of ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK; since he cannot be supposed either to speak of only *two* Evangelists, as *many*; or to include them in the number of these MANY, of whom he speaks with little approbation, if not with some censure. But, say they, had he read the Gospels in question, he would not only have taken notice, but made particular and honourable mention of them.

B b

It

It is further asserted by some, * That he would have written no Gospel himself, had those of ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK been already published and in his hands.

It is easily seen, that in this reasoning, what ST. LUKE would have said, or how he would have acted under certain circumstances, is mere matter of opinion, and taken for granted.

2. §. BUT let us hear and consider his own words :

Luke, Chap. i.

Ver. 1. FORASMUCH as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us,

2. Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word ;

3. It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus,

4. That thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed.

Here are a few terms, of the meaning of which, though not very difficult, it may be proper to give a short explication.

Ver. 1. "Have taken in hand to set forth," ἐπιχειρήσαν ἀνατάξασθαι. This phrase hath been shown by † able critics, to mean much the same as if it had been simply said, *Have composed*, and to be as applicable to works deserving praise as censure. ‡ ORIGEN indeed suspected, that it here implied a cen-

* See Lardner's Supplement, V. i. p. 85.

† Grotius, Casaubon, Alex. Morus. See Wolfius on the place; Raphelius on the same, and Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca, Lib. iv. C. v. §. iv.

‡ TAXA δὲ ὡς τὸ ΕΠΙΧΕΙΡΗΣΕΑΝ ἀληθείαν ἔχει χρησιμείαν τῶν χωρὶς χαρίσματος ἰδιότητων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγραφῇ τῶν εὐαγγελίων. Proem on Luke from a MS. published by Mr. Simon in Lardner's Credib. V. iii. p. 318.

sure,

sure, but the manner in which he speaks, is a proof, that he thought it dubious.

Ver. 2. "*As they delivered them unto us,*" καθὼς παρέδωκεν, Sicut Tradiderunt, *Vulgate*. This may signify, what the Apostles had delivered in *writing* as well as by *word* of mouth; for παρέδωκεν comprehends both. It is so used by ST. PAUL, 2 Theff. ii. 15, and by * Greek ecclesiastical authors. The same latitude has † *Traditio* in Latin writers. Accordingly GROTIUS in a short note on the words thus paraphrases them; "*By word of mouth as the other Apostles, or by writing as MAT-THEW.*"

Ib. "*Who from the beginning were eye-witnesses.*" From the beginning hath the same sense here, as John xv. 27. "*Ye have been with me from the beginning,*" and means, From the beginning of CHRIST's public ministry and preaching.

Ver. 3. "*From the very first,*" ἀνωθεν. This denotes an earlier time commencing before the Incarnation.

Ib. "*Most excellent,*" κρείττιστος. This was a title then given to persons of dignity or in high office. From whence it hath been probably inferred, that THEOPHILUS was then, or had been a public magistrate, and was therefore a converted Gentile.

Ver. 4. "*Wherein thou hast been instructed.*" The Greek word ‡ κατεχθης means to be instructed by word of mouth.

3. §. THIS being premised, I observe,

That ST. LUKE in this INTRODUCTION speaks of two orders of men who gave an account of the life and doctrine of CHRIST. THE FIRST in dignity are the *Eye-witnesses and ministers of the word*, that is, the twelve Apostles; who delivered

* See several instances collected by Suicer under the word παρέδωκεν. V. ii. p. 577.

† Scias nos ab Evangelicis et Apostolicis TRADITIONIBUS non recedere. Cyprian. Epist. iv. Ed. Fell. Illorum autem [scil. sacrorum scriptorum] TRADITIO, quia vera est, quadrat undique, ac sibi tota consentit, et ideo persuadet, quia constanti ratione suffulta est. Lactantii Institut. L. v. C. iii.

‡ Fabricius in the place referred to, Suicer under the word κατεχθης. N°. 1, 2.

to others what they themselves had seen and heard. But this delivery, according to the extent of the word παραδούς, might be written as well as oral. It may therefore comprehend the Gospel of ST. MATTHEW, and I add, that of ST. MARK, as a work of Apostolical authority, and dictated by ST. PETER.

THE SECOND and inferior order here noted are they who had preceded ST. LUKE in committing to writing what they had learned from the Apostles. And if those interpreters were in the right, who suppose him to intimate, that these many writers were unsuccessful in their attempts, no consequence would follow with regard to ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK, but that the first verse of his Preface has no reference to them; which, on this or any other interpretation, is readily allowed. *They* come under another predicament, as authors of the higher order. However ST. LUKE does not seem to censure but commend these many writers whom he distinguishes from the Apostles. He mentions them as having treated of those things which are most surely believed among us, *EVEN AS they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word.* And what could he say more in praise of their fidelity? * He likewise in some sort classes himself with them, and justifies his own undertaking by their example, in saying, *It seemed good to me* ALSO. Had he judged them to have miscarried, he would rather have said, *It seemed good to me* THEREFORE to treat of this subject.

4. §. YET no doubt there was one material difference between Him and them, that they wrote not by any special call, but from ordinary motives of piety and zeal for the cause of CHRIST. Another difference between them seems to be marked by ST. LUKE: for he speaks of them as relating, what they had learned from the eye-witnesses. But he does not say this

* Quorum laudatissimo exemplo incitatus ipse quoque voluerit hoc aggredi. Fabricius ubi supra. So also Lightfoot in his Harmony.

of himself, but "*That he had perfect understanding of all things from the very first.*" And perhaps we may not be very far wide of his intention, if we suppose this change of stile to suggest, that though he had conversed familiarly with the eye-witnesses, and in composing his Gospel did not refuse the assistance of ST. MATTHEW's and ST. MARK's, yet he was principally indebted for this perfect understanding to ST. PAUL, who received his knowledge of the evangelical history and doctrines by immediate revelation from Heaven.

5. §. Thus circumstanced, with what view or in what light could ST. LUKE make separate and special mention of ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK ?

He could not name them in particular as vouchers for the truth of his Gospel: for besides that he relates in it many things for which he has no warranty from them, this had been to *narrow not widen* and strengthen the foundations of its authority; which was built on the inspired knowledge of ST. PAUL, added to the testimony of the eye-witnesses in general.

He could not allege their example as a justification of his undertaking. For put the name of PETER for MARK, and consider how the argument would proceed. "Whereas MATTHEW and PETER, eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, have composed histories of CHRIST, it seemed good to me also, who was no eye-witness or immediate minister of the word, to do the same." These things we see do not cohere. The justification of himself by example, which his modesty inclined him to make, rests on another footing.

This was not a place to make an encomium on their Gospels. For the question naturally connected with this encomium, *Why then he wrote after them?* must have engaged him in so full and distinct an account of his design, as was not suited to the studied brevity of his introduction, perhaps not to the character of an inspired writer. And it was so delicate a task
to

to point out the want of another Gospel, and to show in what manner he had supplied this want; that it was better the reader should discover, than the Evangelist declare more than he hath said.

There was therefore no need, nor any proper opportunity of making mention of ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK in this Preface.

But setting these considerations aside, will it follow from not naming them, that he knew nothing of their Gospels? We cannot doubt but that he had seen some of ST. PAUL's Epistles which were sent to different churches before his arrival at *Rome*. Yet although these Epistles were inspired writings, and the author of them is the chief and almost only subject of the latter half of the Acts of the Apostles, ST. LUKE takes no notice of them, nor gives the least hint that they were written. Why then is his silence an argument more in one case than the other? or than the silence of ST. JOHN concerning the three former Gospels, which he is allowed to have seen? ST. JOHN no where *declares*, he only *signifies*, that he had seen them; and this ST. LUKE hath as clearly done with regard to ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK, by the manner in which his Gospel is composed. And if we require of him a testimony to their truth; what greater could he give, than by always agreeing with their narrations, and often copying their words?

6. §. LET us now consider, what reply this same PREFACE will enable us to make to the objection, That ST. LUKE would have written no Gospel himself, if he had seen the two other.

He distinctly notes two points of time from which an evangelical history might commence. One is, *From the beginning of the word*, or, of our LORD's public ministry; the other, *From the very first*, that is, from the events preparatory and relating to the Incarnation. *The many writers*, as is evident from
the

the second verſe, had deduced their accounts only from the lower period. And therefore the ſilence of others, and the perfect underſtanding which he had of the things belonging to this higher point of time, are aſſigned as one reaſon, why it ſeemed good to him alſo to compoſe a Goſpel.

A ſecond reaſon may be deduced from the manner in which THEOPHILUS and others had received a part of their evangelical knowledge; it had been delivered to them only by the preaching of the word. But this part was of too much importance to be truſted to memory and oral tradition; which might loſe or alter ſome things and confound the order of others. ST. LUKE therefore thought proper to commit them to writing, in a regular and continued hiſtory; that THEOPHILUS and they who were in the ſame ſituation might have a permanent and connected view of facts and doctrines, which they had heard by parts and on different occaſions.

Another reaſon is implied in the DEDICATION of his work to one of the Gentile converts, that he wrote for their inſtruction.

7. §. ON the ground of theſe reaſons the propriety of a THIRD GOSPEL ſeems to ſtand ſecure.

The *firſt* reaſon ſhows, ſince ST. MARK in common with the many writers, had opened his hiſtory at the lower æra, that another, who had the requiſite qualifications, might fitly and wiſely reſume the ſubject on a more extenſive plan.

The *ſecond* juſtifies the writing after ST. MATTHEW; who had not recorded all that was worthy to be known. And it being impoſſible he ſhould do it in ſo ſhort a work; it was extremely uſeful to the church, without detracting from the excellence of his labours, that there ſhould be a review of the ſubject, containing many intereſting particulars that he had omitted; and of which ſome concerned that earlier period, where his Goſpel began.

But

But in this justification the *third* reason, implied in the Dedication to THEOPHILUS, must be taken into the account. ST. MATTHEW had composed his Gospel with an immediate view to those who first wanted one. But when the Gentiles flowed into the church, it was highly expedient that another should be written with such reference to *them* as his bore to the *Jews*. Such a work THEOPHILUS would naturally desire, and might desire it consistently with the greatest regard and honour for ST. MATTHEW. With equal respect for him, might ST. LUKE comply with the request of his NOBLE Pupil, and publish a work, for which not only he would give him thanks, but all the churches of the Gentiles : to whom the other Gospels did not become less edifying by a new testimony to their truth.

And now I think it may be safely affirmed, that nothing said or intimated in ST. LUKE'S Preface militates against the proofs, that he was subsequent to ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK, and was acquainted with their Gospels.

8. §. THE histories of CHRIST which he alludes to, however piously intended or faithfully executed, were obscured by the brightness of the four Gospels, and quickly vanished before them. But in the loss of them, * as Dr. LIGHTFOOT observes, there perished none of the canonical Scriptures but only the works of men. What titles they bore, it seems impossible now to determine. But if I have rightly interpreted what ST. LUKE says of them, it is certain they cannot have been any of the supposititious Gospels that were imputed to Apostles or Apostolical men ; of which sort there were many. The memory and traces of these which still subsist, are monuments of the care and vigilance of the Christian church, in rejecting from the code of holy Scripture what did not belong to it. And the titles which they assumed may serve to discriminate

* Harmony of the Four Gospels, Part i. V. i. p. 392. fol.

DISCOURSE VI. SECT. IV. 201

the measures that are pursued by Verity and Forgery. ST. MARK and ST. LUKE published Gospels in their *own* names: for they knew that the truth would speak for their works and recommend them to the faithful. But these men sought to sanctify their fables by ascribing them to ST. PETER, ST. THOMAS, ST. ANDREW, or other venerable names of the highest dignity in the church.

DISCOURSE THE SEVENTH.

ON ST. JOHN.

S E C T. I.

The design of ST. JOHN's Gospel.

THE last Evangelist was ST. JOHN; who had seen the former Gospels; and bore testimony to the truth of them by composing his own with a manifest reference to them. For he does not write a professed history of our LORD's public ministry, but a supplement to the authentic histories of it already published: the notoriety of which histories is supposed in his Gospel; as it would otherwise be imperfect, and obscure in many places.

This may be exemplified from the following passage:

iv. 43. *Now after two days he departed thence, and went into Galilee. For Jesus himself testified, that a prophet hath no honour in his own country.*

He had said in the beginning of this chapter, that our LORD left *Judea*, and departed again into *Galilee*; and having told what happened in passing thither through *Samarita*, subjoins the words that have been cited. Without other helps than we have from the passage itself we should conclude, that no part of *Galilee* was our LORD's country, but rather *JUDEA*; and that the Evangelist, resuming what he had said above, ver. 1—3. intended to explain a little further, why our LORD quitted that

province. But this is not his meaning. CHRIST was indeed born at *Bethlehem* in *Juda*; but * *Nazareth*, where his relations lived and where he had been brought up, is all along considered as his country. † It was this which he left for *Caper-naum* when he entered on his public ministry. ‡ On this the observation, “That a prophet hath no honour in his own country,” is made in the other Gospels, and to this it relates in ST. JOHN’S. He supposed his readers to know these things, or to have opportunity of knowing them, from the other Evangelists, to whom he tacitly refers; and repeats only so much as sufficed to mark the first coincidence of his Gospel with theirs.

ST. JOHN gives no account of the circumstances of CHRIST’S nativity, of the place of his birth, of his baptism, temptation in the wilderness, and transfiguration on the mount; of his precepts, parables, prophecies, and miracles, § one only excepted, which the other Evangelists have recited. He says little of the life and fate of JOHN the Baptist. He does not mention the calling or mission of the Apostles, nor give a list of their names, nor relate the institution of the LORD’S Supper. It was necessary to his readers to know some of these things, and edifying to know them all. Why then has he omitted them and other interesting facts, or only alluded to them? The reason is plain. Just accounts of them had been published, and were in the hands of the faithful when he wrote. And his conduct in this case is an incontestable proof, that he had not only seen but approved the foregoing Gospels as faithful and true histories, and partly composed his own as supplemental to them.

2. §. BUT this, as I have said, was but a secondary part of his design, and he had a higher point in view. || It was become needful to contend for the faith once delivered to the

* Matth. xiii. 54. Mark vi. 1. Luke iv. 23, 24.

† Matth. iv. 12, 13.

‡ See the passages, to which note * refers.

§ The miracle of feeding five thousand in the wilderness, vi. 1—14.

|| Is cum esset in Asia, et jam tum hæreticorum semina pullularent, Cerinthis, Ebionis, et cæterorum qui negant Christum in carne venisse; quos et ipse in Epistola sua

saints: and he alone, probably, was remaining of the sacred college of Apostles, to undertake the work with the authority of an inspired writer. * He therefore asserted the Godhead of the WORD, the Almighty and Eternal WORD, by whom all things were made, and without whom not any thing was made that was made; the WORD that was made flesh and dwelt among us; † whom GOD sent into the world, that the world through him might be saved. And ST. JOHN teaches throughout his whole Gospel not only the beneficent extent, but the necessity to our happiness of the offices sustained by the Son of GOD; as the Author of salvation, ‡ by feeding us with the bread of life in his heavenly instructions, and § by giving his flesh, upon the cross, for the life of the world; || as the Way, and the Truth, and the Life, without whom no man cometh to the Father; * as the Sender of the Holy Spirit, to teach and illuminate the Apostles, † to sanctify the faithful, ‡ to dwell in them, § and abide with them for ever; || as the vivifying Cause of the resurrection, * whose voice all that are in their graves shall hear and come forth; † and as the Giver of eternal life to as many as hear and obey him.

ST. JOHN has marked out a direct line of truth, by which the humble and devout Christian may walk securely, without attending to the by-ways of error which are endless. But since a doctrine, when the sense of it is controverted, may often be ascertained by a view of the tenets to which it is opposed, it may be useful to some to inquire, what were the imaginations of the Eastern theology, against which this Gospel did more immediately militate. Such persons may consult IRENÆUS, B. iii. Chap. xi. ‡ and the learned moderns who have given

sua Antichristos vocat, et Apostolus Paulus frequenter percutit, coactus est ab omnibus pæne tunc Asiæ episcopis et multarum ecclesiarum legationibus, de divinitate Salvatoris altius scribere. Hieron. Proæm. in Comment. super Matthæum.

* C. i. 1—14. † iii. 17. ‡ vi. 26—33. § ib. 51. || xiv. 6.
• xiv. 16, 17. † vii. 38, 39. ‡ xiv. 17. § ib. 16. || xi. 25.
• v. 28, 29. † x. 27, 28.

† *Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. B. i. Part ii. Chap. i. De rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum, Sæc. i. Sæc. ix. &c.—Dissertat. ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentes, V. i. Dissert. iii. p. 221.*

some

some account of that theology, * or have considered it as refuted by the Apostle.

S E C T. II.

When ST. JOHN published his Gospel.

THE moderns are much divided in opinion concerning the time in which ST. JOHN published his Gospel. Many think, he did it late in life; others, before the destruction of Jerusalem.

I. §. As far as I can perceive, the following passage is the only internal evidence for the earlier date, that merits any regard :

John v. 2. *Now there is at Jerusalem by the sheep-market a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches.*

It is argued from these words, that Jerusalem was standing, when they were written. But it may be answered, that at whatever time ST. JOHN said this, the expression was proper, if Bethesda was remaining: and there is great likelihood that it escaped the general devastation. † For when TITUS VESPASIAN ordered the city to be demolished, he let some things continue for the benefit of the garrison that was to abide there, and he would naturally leave this bathing place fitted up with recesses or porticos for shade and shelter, that he might not deprive the soldiers of a healthful refreshment very grateful to them; and to which he paid such attention, ‡ that he soon

* See *Bullii Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, C. ii. *Waterland's Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity*, and the authors to whom he refers, p. 250. &c. *Michealis' Introductory Lectures*, p. 240. Dr. *Owen's Observations*, p. 87. &c.

† *Josephus Jewish War*, B. vii. C. i. §. 1.

‡ *Amphitheatro dedicato, Thermisque juxta celeriter extractis*. Sueton. in *Vita Titi Vespasiani*, C. vii.

after

after erected magnificent baths at Rome for public convenience. Now since ST. JOHN's proposition may simply regard * *Bethesda*, we cannot be sure that it looks further, or has any view to the state of *Jerusalem*.

The argument therefore from this passage seems inconclusive; and so do some proofs which are alleged for the later date.

2. §. IT is urged, that ST. JOHN wrote after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, because he does not mention the prophecies relating to it. But this will appear a very ambiguous argument to those who consider, how rarely he treads in the steps of the other Evangelists. He may indeed omit these predictions, lest he should seem to prophesy after the event. But he may also have done it pursuant to the method which he observes in most cases, of passing over what was already recorded.

It is said again, that he does not follow the Jewish computation of *the hours of the day*, as the other Evangelists have done, but adopts that which was in use among the Romans, Because, when he wrote, the polity of the Jews was at an end, and the whole nation dispersed.

On whatever side we view this reasoning we shall find it deficient. ST. MARK and ST. LUKE did indeed count the hours after the Jewish manner; but if they wrote in countries which used the same manner, we have no proof that they followed it, because it was Jewish. On the other hand, if ST. JOHN differ from them in this article, he cannot agree with the Romans; for the Roman and Jewish hours were precisely the same.

3. §. HOWEVER I think we may collect from several circumstances, that he wrote a good while later than any other Evangelist, and after the destruction of *Jerusalem*.

His Gospel, as was observed, supposes the existence of the others, and must suppose, not only that they were in being, but

* *Hasselquist* calls what is now shown for Bethesda, An old square and formerly magnificent pool and cistern, p. 134. *Maundrell* speaks doubtfully of these ruins, p. 107.

that they were spread abroad and well known throughout the church : which could not then be effected so expeditiously as it may at present.

4. §. HE is not so reserved as ST. MARK and ST. LUKE in appealing to the Law and the Prophets, but makes his own references to them. In chap. xii. he cites ZECHARIAH once, and ISAIAH twice. And in the history of the Passion, ch. xix. he applies the *Law*, the *Psalms*, and the *Prophets* to CHRIST. This difference between Evangelists, who wrote in great measure for readers of the same kind, is a strong presumption, that ST. JOHN'S Gospel followed ST. MARK'S and ST. LUKE'S at such a distance of time, that the Gentile converts were become more acquainted with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and better able to understand the force of reasonings from them.

5. §. HE takes notice of three Passovers ; and speaks of each, on the first mention of it, as * *the Passover of the Jews*.

This seems to have been said to distinguish it from the *Christian* Passover. But if so, it must have been said, when the one was become of consequence enough to be opposed to the other ; which probably was late in ST. JOHN'S days. The earliest believers were perpetually celebrating the death and resurrection of our LORD. † An anniversary commemoration of them grew into repute and note by degrees, and as a feast of Christian devotion, not of Apostolical precept. Else, it is most likely, there had been an uniformity in the time of keeping it.

6. §. WHEN ST. MATTHEW speaks of crossing the lake of Galilee, he terms it, ‡ *Going to the other side*, 'Εἰς τὸ πέραν; and so does ST. MARK, § with one exception only ; but ST. JOHN

* Ch. ii. 13. vi. 4. xi. 55.

† Suicer in the word Πάσχα, ii. 2, 3. p. 623.

‡ Matth. viii. 18. 28. xiv. 22. xvi. 5. Mark iv. 35. v. 21. vi. 45. viii. 13.

§ v. i.

says,

says, * *To the other side OF THE SEA.* Whence this change of stile from that of his Galilean brethren? Was it, that length of years and length of absence from his native country had corrected a phrase, which was habitual to ST. MATTHEW, and still familiar to ST. PETER, when ST. MARK's Gospel was composed?

They call this lake *the sea of GALILEE*, † *He the sea of TIBERIAS.* He wrote therefore when the new name had prevailed over the ancient; ‡ and when the latter was growing or even grown into disuse: for he explains what it meant, Ch. vi. 1. *After these things Jesus went over the sea of Galilee, which is the sea of Tiberias.*

7. §. IN his last chapter, ver. 18. he mentions a prediction of our LORD concerning ST. PETER: *Verily, verily, I say unto thee, when thou wast young thou girdedst thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not.* Which words foreshowed plainly, that ST. PETER should suffer death as a follower of CHRIST, but did not declare certainly, what death it should be. Yet ST. JOHN in the next verse seems to speak of the death of ST. PETER, and the nature of his death as well known to those, to whom he relates the prediction: *This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify GOD.*

This is generally admitted as evidence, that ST. JOHN's Gospel was published after the death of ST. PETER. I think we may infer from the next paragraph, that it was published after the destruction of *Jerusalem.*

For ST. JOHN proceeds immediately to recite a short conversation concerning himself between ST. PETER and our LORD, and in what sense it was understood by the brethren:

* John vi. 1. 17.

† John vi. 1. xxi. 1.

‡ Josephus calls it, The lake of Tiberias, Jewish War, iv. 8. §. 2. iii. 3. §. 5. but commonly, The lake of Gennesar or Gennefareth. See Sermon. p. 9. note ¶.

Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die.

Upon which, he observes: Yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? And by denying only, that JESUS said, He should not die, he admits, that a promise was made him of living till CHRIST came.

What then is this *Coming* of CHRIST? And why did not ST. JOHN, who was to die like other men, explain what it meant, that he might effectually put a stop to the false surmises of the brethren? I can see but one reason, why he is no more explicit, and it is this: he wrote his Gospel at a time, when it was generally understood among the brethren, that he had lived to see the advent of CHRIST, to which the promise related. He who hereafter will come to consume the wicked with the BRIGHTNESS of his appearing, was already come in the CLOUDS of heaven. The glory of his person was unseen, but the power of his presence was felt in his judgments. And the destruction of *Jerusalem* and the Jewish polity was such a comment on the promise, that ST. JOHN should survive till CHRIST came, that there needed no other.

8. §. ON this ground, which appears to be firm and good, let us consider an account given by him, Ch. xi. 47—50. of the proceedings of the Jewish rulers. In a conference among themselves concerning CHRIST, they said; *What do we? for this man doth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.* The result of the consultation was, *That it was expedient he should die.* And what they judged so expedient, they soon accomplished. However the Romans came, and took away both their place and nation. And great and dreadful was the fall of them. Afterwards ST. JOHN published

lished this account of their counsels and proceedings; first, As a manifestation to mankind of the visible hand and just vengeance of Heaven on a people, who had concurred with the unrighteous policy of their rulers, and had been the betrayers and murderers of the Just One: secondly, As a call to the sad survivors of these calamities; that *the remnant being affrighted might give glory to God* by their conversion.

ST. MATTHEW had shown early, that they had made themselves and their children responsible for the blood of CHRIST; and now ST. JOHN reminds them, that it had been required at their hands.

These several circumstances are strongly on the side of those, who maintain *the late publication of ST. JOHN's Gospel*.

9. §. As to the place in which it was published; If it can be proved, that ST. JOHN counted the hours as we do; that some of his seven churches did the same; and that, as far as appears, the use of such hours was peculiar to that small district of the Roman empire, we shall then have an internal, and probably an intended mark, that he composed his Gospel somewhere within the circle of these churches, and may reasonably abide by the authority of the ancients, that he composed it at *Ephesus*.

His hours will be considered afterwards. I shall close the present Discourse with a few reflections on a material article of this work.

S E C T. III.

Each succeeding Evangelist confirms the authenticity of the preceding Gospels. The credit and testimony of ST. MARK and ST. LUKE not weakened, because they had seen ST. MATTHEW's Gospel.

I. §. * THE Evangelists in succession pursued a wise and sure method of warranting the truth and genuineness of each former Gospel with all the authority of the latter. Let us for instance suppose ST. PETER to have been requested or to have desired to leave his testimony with the church in ST. MARK's Gospel, of the authenticity of ST. MATTHEW's. How was this to be effected? He might have mentioned it, † as he does ST. PAUL's Epistles, in terms of respect, and called it, *The Gospel of our beloved brother MATTHEW*: by which or the like words he would doubtless have borne witness to the truth of it. But if a question should arise, not whether ST. MATTHEW had composed a true Gospel, but which was the true Gospel of ST. MATTHEW, such a testimony could no more decide it, than the ranking of ST. PAUL's Epistles with the other Scriptures can determine, whether the Epistle to the Hebrews be ST. PAUL's. If then a Gospel was afterwards to appear under the title of ‡ *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which might be mistaken, and actually was mistaken

* See the conclusion of Dr. Owen's Observations on the Four Gospels.

† 2 Pet. iii. 15.

‡ The Gospel of the Ebionites, which was in the main the same with that of the Nazarenes, was intitled by themselves, *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*. It was partly a compilation from ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE; and what was taken from the former was plainly translated from the Greek. Yet about the middle of the fourth century a notion began to prevail, that this was the authentic Hebrew of ST. MATTHEW's Gospel.

See TWELLS's *Critical Examination. Reply*, p. 110—127. *Second Vindication*, p. 19. 68. JONES's *New Method*, V. i. Part ii. C. xxv. p. 331.

by

by some, for the authentic Gospel of ST. MATTHEW ; how could ST. PETER deposite with the church a better touchstone by which to detect the *adulterate*, than by incorporating so much of the *genuine* into his own Gospel ?

Again, if ST. LUKE transcribed several passages from ST. MARK, we have the attestation not only of ST. LUKE, but of his friend and principal ST. PAUL, to the verity of this Gospel.

Lastly, ST. JOHN authenticated the three foregoing Gospels by an opposite method, that is, by *omitting* not *repeating* what they had related. Of which enough has been said.

As to ST. JOHN's Gospel, if it was written late, as many suppose, and I think with probability, the church of CHRIST had then acquired some strength and consistence, and a more easy and settled correspondence of its distant members with each other. And perhaps no city was better situated than *Ephesus* to spread intelligence to the generality of places where any Christians resided. A city so much frequented formed a connection between the two great divisions of *Europe* and *Asia*. Here it is generally allowed, that ST. JOHN composed his Gospel ; and the notoriety of the fact superseded the want of another Apostle to attest it.

2. §. I SHALL beg leave to add only a few words more in answer to the objections of those, who think, that we weaken the evidence of the evangelical history, and lessen the credit of ST. MARK and ST. LUKE, by supposing them to have written with a knowledge of ST. MATTHEW's Gospel. Let the matter be examined without prejudice.

The Gospel must be true, if ST. MATTHEW's is a true history of it : to satisfy us of which, the proof of two things is requisite ; first, That he was a faithful relater of what he had seen and heard ; secondly, That the relation which bears his name is his relation.

The first thing, That ST. MATTHEW could not be deceived himself and would not deceive us, but related faithfully what he

he knew to be fact, is proved by the arguments which establish the credit and authority of the other Apostles, and which certainly are not the worse for admitting, that ST. MARK and ST. LUKE had seen his Gospel and approved of it.

The second point, That the Gospel which bears his name is HIS Gospel, hath been shown just above to be strongly confirmed by the works of these Evangelists. For if we rightly esteem a few sentences of it found in CLEMENS ROMANUS and other Apostolical Fathers an argument for its authenticity; in all reason the many passages of it which occur in the writings of ST. MARK and ST. LUKE must be an argument of greater weight.

And their own credit is not diminished, but in one view seen to advantage by the use which they make of ST. MATTHEW.

The credit of their knowledge is not diminished: because, by enlarging on his account, as they frequently do, in relating the same thing, they show that they were not indebted to him for the knowledge even of those things which they partly relate in his words; but were masters of the subject, and wrote with an antecedent and full idea of it.

But the credit of their veracity appears in a fairer light. In some places they seem to differ from him; and though the difference is only in appearance, they must be sensible, that this appearance might give, and it hath often given, a handle to cavil and exception against the Gospel history, which common prudence would have taught them to avoid in writing after an Apostle, if they had not been conscious of the certainty of the facts recited by them. It is truth only that hath this fearless simplicity, and gives its testimony without art or circumspection.

DISCOURSE THE EIGHTH.

IN TWO PARTS.

PART THE FIRST.

ON THE METHOD IN WHICH ST. JOHN
RECKONS HIS HOURS.

S E C T. I.

Three instances of ST. JOHN's hours considered.

IT was the way of the ancients to divide the day into twelve hours, and the night into as many. The first hour of the day was an hour after the sun rose, and the twelfth was when it set. This was the way in *Judea*, and to this the other Evangelists adhere. But ST. JOHN appears to have reckoned the hours as we do, from midnight to noon, and again from noon to midnight. And it may be observed, that he mentions the hour of the day oftener than any other Evangelist, as if with design to give his readers an opportunity of discerning his method by comparing one passage with another. The several instances shall be produced and considered, as they stand in his Gospel.

Chap. i. 38—40.

*Then Jesus turned and saw them following, and saith unto them,
What seek ye? They say unto him, Rabbi, (which is to
say, being interpreted, Master) where dwellest thou? He
saith*

216 DISCOURSE VIII. PART I. SECT. I.

*said unto them, Come and see. They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him that day. For [rather, * now] it was about THE TENTH HOUR. One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother.*

If the time here intended was that which we may call *Jewish*, (to distinguish it, not from the *Greek* and *Roman* which were the same with the *Jewish*, but from the modern) the tenth hour was about four in the afternoon, or two hours before the day ended in *Judea*: with which time neither the words nor circumstances of the narration seem to agree. For the words, *They abode with him that day*, rather imply, that they spent a good part of the day with him. And ST. JOHN, as if he would intimate as much, and that he did not reckon after the *Jewish* manner, relates several particulars which followed on that day. For ANDREW being invited by our LORD to his dwelling, came and conversed with him long enough to be satisfied, that he was the MESSIAH. He then went out to seek for his brother PETER, and having found him, returned to our LORD's abode with him. After which, delighted with the happy discovery he had made, he seems to have gone in search of others of his acquaintance, and to have introduced them also; as we may collect from verse 41. where it is said, *He first findeth his own brother Simon*; for this implies, that he found and brought others after him. Now to show, that what is here mentioned was all done in one and the same day, ST. JOHN says a little beneath, ver. 43. *The day following Jesus would go forth into Galilee, &c.* And since these things appear to be the transactions of some hours, the most reasonable account of this tenth hour is, that it was ten in the morning.

* ὥρα δὲ ἦν ὡς δέκατη. Hora autem erat quasi decima. Vulgate. Or il etoit environs la dixieme heure. Beaufobre.

DISCOURSE VIII. PART I. SECT. I. 217

Chap. iv. 6. JESUS *therefore being wearied with his journey sat thus on the well. (And it was about the sixth hour.) There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water.*

The sixth hour in the Jewish computation was mid-day. But it is not very probable, that this was the time intended. Among the people of the East, exact and tenacious observers of their customs, the women had their stated times of going to draw water: which they did, not in the heat of the day, but in the cool of the morning or evening. That one of their times was the morning may be inferred from 1 Sam. ix. 11, 12.

And as they went up the hill to the city, they found young maidens going out to draw water, and said unto them, Is the Seer here? And they answered them, and said, He is; behold he is before you: make haste now, for he came to day to the city; for there is a sacrifice of the people to day in the high place.

It was certainly in the morning that SAUL and his servant, entering the city of SAMUEL, met these maidens: for SAMUEL was arrived but just before them, and the sacrifice was not begun, which with the following festivity would take up great part of the day. * And SAMUEL partly on this account, and partly through hospitality, and not because his guests came late into the town, would transact no particular business with SAUL that day, but deferred it to the next morning.

† That another of their times was the evening, is evident from Gen. xxiv. 11.

* Et lux cum primum terris se castina reddet
Auxilio lætos dimittam, opibusque juvabo.
Interea sacra hæc, quando huc venistis amici,
Annua, quæ differre nefas, celebrate faventes
Nobiscum. ÆN. L. viii. 170.

Virgil describes this festival as beginning in the forenoon, and continuing till evening.

† In the Odyssey, B. vii. v. 19. Ulysses is met by Minerva, as the sun was going down, under the form of a Phæacian virgin. She is described as carrying a water-pitcher: because, I presume, the maidens at that time went out to draw water. So that the same custom prevailed in ancient Greece.

And he made his camels to kneel down without the city by a well of water, at the time of the evening, even the time that women go out to draw water.

It was most likely in the evening that this woman of *Samaria* came to draw water: it being said, that *JESUS* was wearied with his journey. After some little discourse with him, the woman leaving her water-pot, returned hastily into the city; where the men of *Sychar* were come forth into the street to enjoy the cool of the air, and assembled for their evening conversation. Their curiosity is excited to behold the wonderful stranger of whom she informed them. They attend her to the well; discourse with him, and entreat him that he would tarry with them, that is, that he would lodge that night in their city: which he did, and *abode there two days*; I suppose, till the second morning after his arrival, when he set off for *Galilee*.

Ch. iv. 52, 53. *Then inquired he of them the hour when he began to amend: and they said unto him, Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him. So the father knew that it was at the same hour, in the which JESUS said unto him, Thy son liveth.*

The situation both of *Cana*, where our *LORD* was, and of *Capernaum*, from whence a nobleman came to him as soon as he heard of his arrival in *Galilee*, is a little uncertain. Geographers place them about a day's journey asunder; but they seem to have been nearer. *Capernaum* is laid down in the maps as nearly north of *Tiberias*, and so less distant from *Cana*, which was north-west of both. * Yet *JOSEPHUS* marched from *Cana* to *Tiberias*, in one night as I apprehend, with two hundred armed men. And the nobleman, whose errand was to beseech

* Life of Josephus, C. xvii.

our LORD to come down and heal his son, whom he said, He had left *at the point of death*, still hoped there would be time enough for CHRIST to return with him to *Capernaum* before he expired. CHRIST answered his request with saying, *Go thy way, thy son liveth*. Now this conference happened at the *seventh hour*. The question is, whether it was at *one* in the afternoon, according to Jewish time, or at *seven* in the evening, according to ours. If it was at *one* in the afternoon, there were so many hours of day light remaining, that paternal affection, animated with the hope of finding a dying son restored to health, would naturally have prompted a tender father to return home immediately. But if age or infirmities rendered him unable to make such haste, surely his family, when they saw so sudden and wonderful a change in his son, would, instead of staying till the next day, have sent off a messenger immediately, who with good speed might have brought the joyful news to *Cana* that night. But neither of these things was done. The nobleman set out from *Cana*, and his servants from *Capernaum* the next morning, and met on the road; where he first learned the success of our LORD's promise to him. It is therefore most probable, that when CHRIST dismissed him with this promise, it was now *seven* in the evening. In this case indeed, ST. JOHN must have given the meaning rather than the precise words of the servants, when he makes them say, *Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him*. But such things are done by the most faithful historians, and are not without precedent in the * Gospels.

* Compare Mark xiv. 30. with Matth. xxvi. 34. And see Grötius' Notes on Luke ii. 12. and Matth. xxvi. 18.

S E C T. II.

The fourth instance considered.

CHAP. xix. 13, 14. *When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth, and sat down in the judgement-seat, in a place that is called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew Gabbatha. And it was the preparation of the passover, and ABOUT THE SIXTH HOUR.*

Some have contended, that the proper reading in this place is THE THIRD HOUR. * But all good manuscripts have THE SIXTH. And it is scarce conceivable, that a reading so contrary to the ideas of most transcribers should have found its way into the copies so early, and been propagated so widely, if it had not been in the original. Nor need we be embarrassed by it. Allow it, in consistence with the foregoing examples, to mean *six in the morning*, and it will suit the place in which it stands admirably well; which *the third hour* would not. We have only to make a proper distribution of the events of this morning according to the notes of time with which the Evangelists furnish us.

The night was divided either into twelve hours, or four equal watches. † Of the latter division we have several traces in the Gospels. And here ST. MATTHEW, ST. MARK, and ST. JOHN note the third watch by the COCK-CROWING, and call the fourth the PROI; as ST. MARK does also in another place, where he speaks of all the four watches; *At even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning, the Proi.* xiii. 35. The terms of the COCK-CROWING and the PROI it will be convenient to retain.

* See Mill and Wettstein on the place.

† Matth. xiv. 25. xxiv. 43. Mark vi. 48. Luke xii. 38.

Were

DISCOURSE VIII. PART I. SECT. II. 221

Were the learned agreed about the year of SAVIOUR's Passion, we might compute with a little more accuracy. But it is sufficient for our purpose, that the Jewish Passover was not before the vernal equinox; and that the sun therefore must have risen by six on the day of the Crucifixion: which will make the third watch, or *Cock-crowing*, reckoned from midnight, consist of three hours, and the fourth watch, or *Proi*, ending at sun-rising, of three more.

Let us then examine what events the evangelical accounts restrain within the *Cock-crowing*, and what they limit to the beginning of the *Proi*: that we may see how much time remained, and how it was disposed, till we arrive at the point which ST. JOHN calls *about the sixth hour*.

It is probable our blessed LORD was brought before one in the morning to the palace of CAIAPHAS; where the rulers and elders were met; * except that part of them who attended the apprehending of him, and returned in triumph with their prisoner. The assembly or consistory was then compleat. He was first examined before them concerning his doctrine, and when he referred them to his hearers for an account of it, the witnesses were called in, ready at hand, and prepared for their business: for the search of the rulers was not for the persons but the testimony of these men. Their testimony not amounting to the purpose of condemning him to death; the consistory consulted among themselves how to proceed, and resolved, that the question should be solemnly proposed to him by the high priest, Whether he were the CHRIST. While this was in debate, he was in † the outer or lower hall, where the servants attended; having been ordered out of the council-room. And while he was under guard in one part of this hall or court, he heard PETER, standing with the servants in another part, disown him the third time. He was then led again into the coun-

* See Luke xxii. 52.

† Ἐξω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ. Matth. xxvi. 69. Ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ ἔστω. Mark xiv. 66.

cil-room;

cil-room; where being solemnly interrogated, Whether he were the CHRIST, and as solemnly declaring, That he was, he was found guilty of death by the unanimous verdict of the court; and being once more sent out of their presence, was given up to the insolence of their officers and servants. A conference ensued among themselves, in which it was quickly determined, to lead him bound to the Prætorium without loss of time, that PILATE might ratify and execute the sentence they had passed upon him.

In this summary it is supposed, *first*, That our LORD was in the outer hall when PETER disowned him the third time; and *secondly*, That the question, Whether he were the CHRIST, was not proposed to him at different times or places. The former article will follow the confirmation of the latter; which seems very evident, notwithstanding the dissension of harmonists about it.

ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK relate, that as soon as the high priest had asked him, *Art thou the CHRIST?* and had received his answer, he rent his clothes, and addressing himself to the council, said, *What need we any further witnesses? Ye have heard the blasphemy; What think ye?* Upon which *they all condemned him to be guilty of Death.* Now it is extremely improbable, as they saw him little disposed to make answers, that they put the success of their cause to the hazard of procuring the same reply from him at a second meeting of the same judges: for what? for the sake of coming to the same conclusion, *What need we any further witness?*

The question therefore, *Art thou the CHRIST?* was proposed but at one time: and the council in which it was proposed, continued without adjournment where they first assembled, that is, in the palace of the high priest. For ST. JOHN, very exact in describing what he does describe of the occurrences of this morning, says expressly, *Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas to the Prætorium, xviii. 28.* where *from Caiaphas* means *from the house*

house of Caiaphas; as, *From the ruler of the synagogue*, Mark v. 35. is justly rendered, *From the ruler of the synagogue's house*. We may also infer from ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK, that the procession to the Prætorium was directly from the house of CAIAPHAS. But how then are we to reconcile them with ST. LUKE? who in the following passage seems to speak, 1. Of a later time; 2. As some think, of a change of place in which the council was held; 3. Of a different mode of interrogating our LORD:

xxii. 66—71. *And as soon as it was day, the elders of the people, and the chief priests, and the scribes came together, and led him into their council, saying, Art thou the Christ? tell us. And he said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go. Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God. Then said they all, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am. And they said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth.*

A literal version of the first part of this paragraph will help to remove a great part of the difficulty: *And AS DAY WAS COMING, the elders of the people, and the chief priests and the scribes WERE ASSEMBLED, and led him into their council.*

I think there is no doubt but, *ὡς ἡμέρα ἐγένετο*, may be properly rendered, *As day was coming*. The material question is, how far back ST. LUKE extends the notion of *day coming*. And this may be determined by the sense of a similar expression, *γενόμενης δὲ ἡμέρας*, as used in another place, which I give in our version: Luke iv. 42. *And when it was day, he departed, and went into a desert place*. ST. MARK on the same occasion says, i. 35. *And in the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out and departed into a desert place*. The two passages compared show plainly, with what latitude ST. LUKE speaks of *day coming*.

coming. And with the same latitude, I conceive, he uses these words again, Acts xii. 18. *Now as soon as it was day* [γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας] *there was no small stir among the soldiers what was become of Peter*. ST. PETER was in custody of sixteen soldiers, constantly chained between two of them: and these relieving each other in course, every two would have a turn of three hours in the four and twenty. The delivery of ST. PETER could not well be earlier or later than in some part of the third military watch. It was probably soon after midnight: when the angel who released him laid or kept the soldiers asleep by a miraculous power. But this power operating no longer than the case required, they would be awakened by the next change of the guard, and perceive that their prisoner was gone: which occasioned the *no small stir among them*. The change of the guard was at three in the morning, when the fourth military watch began. This therefore is the time which ST. LUKE denotes by γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας, *as soon as it was day*; and when he says in the text before us, *ὡς ἡμέρα ἐγένετο*, the words, which are in a form oftener used to express what is incomplete, may doubtless be understood of the commencement, as well as of any other part of the fourth watch. When the sun is up, he says, *the day is fully come* [for this seems the meaning of Συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν, Acts ii. 1.]; but from the point of equal distance between midnight and sun-rising he considers it as *coming*.

Again, he does not say, that the elders and chief priests *did then assemble*, he tells us, that *they were assembled*. As he passed over the depositions of the false witnesses, and the previous inquiries, he had no occasion before to mention their meeting. But when he came to that part of the trial which he purposed to relate, it was then proper, he should inform his readers, how the fact stood; that what our LORD professed before the council, and what they resolved in consequence of his profession, was done in a full convention of the Jewish elders and magistrates. For this reason he takes notice here, *that they*
were

were assembled. But neither in this place nor any other does he give the least hint of a removal from the house of CAIAPHAS, to which he had before told us, our LORD was brought prisoner.

The remaining difficulty is not very formidable; that what ST. MATTHEW makes the question of the high priest only, *I adjure thee by the living GOD that thou tell us, whether thou be the CHRIST the Son of GOD*; ST. LUKE represents as the question of the assembly at large, *Then said they all, Art thou then the Son of GOD*? If the high priest put the question with consent and by advice of his assessors, it was in truth the question of the whole court, and ST. LUKE might justly mention it as such. However it may be admitted, that their eagerness to convict him might prompt them to second the question of the high priest, and that our LORD having distinctly answered the one, did then vouchsafe to make the same avowal separately to the others. This may be admitted as extremely probable. I only maintain, that ST. LUKE means not to intimate an adjournment of the council, or a different time of proposing this solemn and decisive question. But if CHRIST was led into their council on this occasion, it is plain he must have been in the outer hall or court for a while before. In which situation it is easy to conceive, that he heard himself disowned the third time, and turned and looked upon Peter.

I observed just above, that ST. LUKE's words, *As day was coming*, will allow this leading of our LORD into their council to have been as soon as the *Proi* began. And thus early it seems to have been according to ST. MATTHEW and ST. MARK; who connect it immediately with the conclusion of ST. PETER's fall, and that again with the second crowing of the cock, which was emphatically *the cock-crowing*, and the boundary between the third and fourth watches. It is true, they speak of the *natural*, not (if I may so call it) the *civil* cock-crowing. But what reason is there to imagine, that they did not nearly concur?

* PLINY speaking of these fowls observes, *That at the fourth military watch they recall men to their cares and labour.* † Others of the ancients who enumerate the parts into which the space from midnight to full day is divided, and name the rest from the changes of darkness and light, define two of these parts by the *crowing* and *silence* of the cocks. They were therefore a regular index of a certain time, at least in those southern climates; and the presumption is, that in the instance under consideration the natural and civil cock-crowing were concomitant. But, if it was then about the vernal equinox, the civil cock-crowing was at three in the morning.

At three then in the morning our LORD *was led into their council*; and soon after pronounced guilty of death. Then followed what is thus related: *And straightway in the PROI, the chief priests, having held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council, and having bound Jesus, led him away and delivered him to Pilate.* These words of ST. MARK imply speed in resolving and acting; and so do ST. LUKE's; *And they said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth. And the whole multitude of them arose, and led him unto Pilate.* Probably therefore they were at the Prætorium before four in the morning; when, if the dawn was not begun, there was however the light of a full moon.

‡ Here our LORD was accused of assuming the dignity of a

* Cum sole eunt cubitum, quartaque castrensi vigilia ad curas laboremque revocant. Nec solis ortum incautis patiuntur obrepere, diemque venientem nunciant cantu. L. x. C. xxiv.

† Primum tempus diei dicitur mediæ noctis inclinatio; deinde gallicinium, inde conticium, cum et galli conticescunt, et homines etiam tum quiescunt; deinde diluculum, id est, cum incipit dies dignosci, inde mane, cum dies clarus est. Macrobius Saturnal. B. i. C. iii. Ed. Var. towards the end.

Nox intempesta, id est, media; gallicinium quo galli cantant; conticium, post cantum gallorum silentium; aurora vel crepusculum matutinum, tempus quod ante solem est. Servius in Æneid. iii. v. 587.

To the same purpose Censorinus, C. xxiv. In all which authors it is supposed, that the cock-crowing was very regular, and that it ended sometime before the very beginning of the morning dawn.

‡ Luke xxiii. 2.

king

king in prejudice of CÆSAR's authority. To which accusation he did not vouchsafe to reply; except when * PILATE asked him in the Prætorium, Whether he were the king of the Jews. He then declared, that he was a king, but that his kingdom was not of this world. Upon which PILATE went out and professed, that *he found no fault in him*. Presently after, having learnt † *that the man was a Galilean*, he remitted the hearing of his cause to the tetrarch of Galilee. But by HEROD he was quickly sent back with a contemptuous testimony of his innocence. His prosecutors returned with him; to whom PILATE observed, that even HEROD had expressed no fear or jealousy of him; and that he himself found no fault in him. And now knowing, perhaps from some inquiries made while they were absent with HEROD, that the chief priests and elders ‡ *had delivered him for envy*, he applied himself to the populace, who were expecting the annual indulgence of having a prisoner released to them whom they desired. To them he offered the releasement of JESUS; but the offer not meeting with acceptance, he then confined them to the choice of JESUS or BARABBAS, that their suffrages might still fall as he wished. At the instigation of their superiors they chose BARABBAS, notorious for the sedition of which they were accusing our LORD. Yet he seems still to have left them the liberty of saving JESUS, by asking, § *What will ye then that I should do unto him whom ye call the king of the Jews?* But instead of requesting his life, they called out for his crucifixion with such vehement and loud voices, that || PILATE, to appease their fury, ordered him to be scourged by his soldiers in the Prætorium; and then to be brought forth and exhibited to them; prefacing his appearance with another attestation of his innocence, and expecting, that such a spectacle as was set before them must excite commiseration in their breasts: BEHOLD THE MAN. But this taste of blood served

* John xviii. 33.
Mark xv. 12.

† Luke xxiii. 6.
|| John xix. 1—13.

‡ Matth. xxvii. 18.

only to sharpen their appetites for it. The cry of, Crucify him, Crucify him, was reiterated, and a new charge brought against him, *that he made himself* THE SON OF GOD. PILATE startled at this went again into the Prætorium, and asked him, *Whence he was*. Our LORD, not choosing to influence a judge, who was concerned only with his innocence, by revealing his dignity, gave no answer to this question; but spoke a few words to another point with such divine composure, that PILATE sought the more to release him. Enraged at which conduct of the governor, the Jewish rulers threw out hints of accusing him to a jealous and suspicious master, as no friend of CÆSAR, if he let this man go. He therefore sat down on the tribunal to pass the sentence they desired, yet still hesitated to pronounce it. AND IT WAS ABOUT THE SIXTH HOUR.

I think I have mentioned the heads of all the particulars that the evangelical history requires us to include in this period, beginning at the first appearance of CHRIST before PILATE, and containing, as we compute, two hours and an half. The time seems sufficient, if it be considered, that some things favoured and others demanded expedition.

If CAIAPHAS did not send to HEROD and PILATE, when our LORD was first brought prisoner to his house, certainly he would dispatch messengers to them, as soon as he was condemned in the council; to HEROD, that he might be on his guard and watch over his Galilean subjects, who came in great numbers to the feast, * lest they should make any disturbance in favour of CHRIST; and to PILATE, † who seems to have lent them some soldiers to assist in apprehending him, that they were bringing their prisoner before him.

‡ As our LORD kept the Passover in the city, his late departure from it shows, that the gates were left open that night.

* Magis enim metuebant Galilæos tanquam ipsius Jesu populares. Grot. in Matth. xxvi. 5.

† Wolfius in Matth. xxvi. 47.

‡ Compare Mark xiv. ver. 13. with ver. 26.

When

DISCOURSE VIII. PART I. SECT. II. 229

When therefore there was an amazing concourse of a mutinous nation in Jerusalem and the villages about it, there was great need of vigilance in the governors without any singular occurrence. It cannot therefore seem strange, that on such an occasion as this, PILATE, and quickly after him HEROD, were early up, and ready to receive the Jewish rulers at their first appearance. The first time they continued but a little while with PILATE: *for as soon as he knew that Jesus belonged unto Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod, who was himself also at Jerusalem at that time.* It is most likely that both of them (and the high priest also) lodged near the temple. The tetrarch of Galilee resided in his own territories, and the procurator of Judea at Cæsarea. They came but occasionally to Jerusalem. And at such times they and the whole train of each might be received, without interfering, in the * superb edifice erected by HEROD the Great: for it consisted of two distinct spacious buildings; one of which he named Cæsaréum and the other Agrippéum; and JOSEPHUS in one place calls it not a palace † but palaces. This edifice, as well as the tower Antonia, which was a palace and fortress together, stood near the temple and communicated with it. Little time therefore being lost in moving from place to place, the first examination before PILATE, and the interview with HEROD, might come within such compass, as that our LORD might be remanded to PILATE by five in the morning: at which time it was broad day-light.

There was great eagerness for a speedy determination on one side, and a necessity for it on the other. The Jewish rulers, who had hitherto surrounded the tribunal with their followers and dependants, were jealous of delay and of a variable multitude, and pressed on with ardor and violence, while circumstances favoured. The proof of the crime alleged rested on the sole authority of the accusers: ‡ *If he were not a malefactor we*

* Josephus, Jewish War, B. i. C. xxi. §. 1.

† Ibid. B. v. C. iv. §. 4, Τὰ βασιλεία.

‡ John xviii. 30.

would

230 DISCOURSE VIII. PART I. SECT. II.

would not have delivered him up unto thee. And though PILATE twice interrogated JESUS in the Prætorium, he did it hastily, and as it were with the sound of their outcry in his ears. He well knew the seditious spirit of the nation, uneasy under a foreign yoke, * and confiding in their numbers at the Passovers. † A tumult was beginning and might increase with an accession of people. It was requisite therefore to resolve speedily, whether he would appease them by compliance, or repel them by force; which then especially he would avoid.

If the hour in question is not six in the morning, it is noon-day. But will this construction of it suit, I say not with the other Evangelists, but upon the whole with ST. JOHN himself? He tells us, ‡ that PILATE came forth and gave audience to the Jews in the *Proi*. Now if the matter began ere the sun was up, and when it had reached the meridian was still not finished, how will the tract of time and train of circumstances go hand in hand? Must not the latter unavoidably stop short of the former? Of the four Evangelists ST. JOHN is the fullest and most particular, except that he takes no notice of HEROD, in relating what concerned our SAVIOUR in this period. But the detail of his relation conveys no idea of so much time: which indeed is repugnant to credibility for other reasons. We have the same persons assembled and acting together, the same cause going on all along, a cause not puzzled nor retarded by witnesses, but maintained by mere dint of assertion, and urged with such vehemence on the part of the prosecutors, that what delay there was of the sentence was occasioned purely by the judge's reluctance to deliver it. But since it is evident, that this judge rather evaded their attacks upon him than withstood them with the firmness of a man of conscience, is it to be imagined, that he demurred till noon, in so critical a season, and assaulted on every side by their fierce and turbulent importunities? Probability

* Μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς αὐτῶν εὐνοίας ἄπτεται. Josephus, Jewish War. B. i. C. iv. §. 3.

† Matt. xxvii. 24.

‡ John xviii. 28.

demands,

DISCOURSE VIII. PART I. SECT. II. 231

demands, that we fix the boundary of his resistance much nearer to the *Proi*.

Now the time which we allow for the main of his endeavours to save our LORD, is adequate to the events comprised in it, and best suited to the spirit of the day and the conduct of the parties contending on this occasion. The time, reckoned from their return at five from HEROD, may be supposed an hour and half: for the words, *About the sixth hour*, do not so straighten us, but that we may add twenty or thirty minutes. It suffices, that PILATE sat down on the tribunal, if not precisely at six, not later than half an hour after it.

We have followed the plain road before us from the beginning of the *Proi*, and are brought to this conclusion. We shall come to it again by another way, that is, by returning from a settled term beyond, towards that which we are desirous to find, and making a probable estimate of the requisite distance between them. The settled term is the hour of the Crucifixion given us * by ST. MARK; whose exactness with regard to the times when the supernatural darkness began and ended, being confirmed by the testimonies of ST. MATTHEW and ST. LUKE, leaves no room to question his accuracy in the time of the Crucifixion, though he alone mentions it. It was therefore THE THIRD HOUR, or nine in the morning: and we are to consider, first, What time the procession from the Prætorium to mount Calvary, and the act of crucifying our LORD took up; secondly, Before this procession began, what time he was detained in the Prætorium, when PILATE had delivered him to be crucified; thirdly, How long the sentence of death was delayed after PILATE sat down on the tribunal.

1. Mount Calvary was near to the city; but the procession to it must have been slow. † At the Paschal Supper of the fore-

* xv. 25.

† Luke xxii. 16—18. Of the Passover he says, *I will not ANY MORE eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of GOD: but of the cup; Take this and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of GOD shall come.*

going

going night, CHRIST seems to have denied himself the refreshment of the cup which he gave to his disciples; and his body was enfeebled by his agony in the garden, and what it had since endured, particularly by pain and loss of blood when he was scourged. He himself carried his cross to the gate of the city; and though it was there laid on SIMON the Cyrenian, he had further to go, and * a small eminence to ascend. To this procession, the preparations and act of crucifixion, we may well allot a FULL HOUR.

2. Before he was led forth, that the executions might be finished together, the two robbers, if no more prisoners, were to be tried. † For in cases where no appeal lay to the emperor or Roman senate, the sentence of the judge was followed by the immediate punishment of the offender. They had not therefore been examined by PILATE on any preceding day; nor in this morning, in which the trial of our LORD came on so early. Probably, while his cause was depending, they were brought from the prison to the hall where the soldiers kept guard, that they might be in readiness. In this place the penitent thief attending to the deportment of JESUS, while he was scourged and insulted by the Roman soldiers, might conceive that sense of his innocence, meekness, and majesty, which prepared him for the grace of perfect faith on the cross. When these men were condemned, they were to be scourged at the Prætorium according to the Roman manner, before they were taken to be crucified. To the time employed in trying, condemning, and scourging them, if we add a short previous pause, which PILATE might require to compose his mind not slightly agitated and disturbed, may we not reckon the whole another

* Mount Calvary, a rocky hill, neither high nor ample. Sandys' Travels, p. 124. Mount Calvary, which is a small eminency or hill upon the greater mountain of Moriah. Maundrell's Journey to Jerusalem, p. 68.

† Modestinus in L. Constitut. xvi. de appellationibus. Constitutiones quæ de recipiendis nec non appellationibus loquuntur, ut nihil novi fiat, locum non habent in eorum persona, quos damnatos statim puniri interest; ut sunt insignes latrones, vel seditionum concitatores, vel duces factionum. Apud Crenium in Fascic. Tom. iii. p. 610.

DISCOURSE VIII. PART I. SECT. II. 233

FULL HOUR? In the mean while CHRIST was guarded by the soldiers; into whose hands therefore he was delivered at seven, or rather earlier.

3. When PILATE had taken his seat on the tribunal in order to pronounce sentence of death on CHRIST, * he received a message from his wife, and still fluctuating † expostulated once more with the Jews about him, declared his innocence again, and his own averfeness to condemn him: *When he saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person, see ye to it. Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us and on our children.* Upon which he decreed, *that it should be as they required.* A small allowance of time for each of these particulars will bring us within *half an hour of six.* Here then the computations meet, whether we reckon on from the *Proi*, or back from the *third hour*: by either account PILATE *sat down in the judgement-seat* between six and seven in the morning.

The immediate object of this inquiry may not have needed the length of disquisition into which I have been led. But if it can help to throw light on any part of the history of our blessed SAVIOUR's Passion, it will want no apology to a Christian reader: who will regard this question of hours chiefly because of its connection with that most interesting and important history.

The result of the inquiry is, I trust, that no time agrees so well with ST. JOHN's sixth hour, and the transactions that happened about this hour, as SIX IN THE MORNING. And then in all the instances in which he names the hour, it hath been made most probable, that he reckoned as we do.

* Matth. xxvii. 19. When he was set down on the judgement-seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man, &c.

† Ibid. ver. 23.

S E C T. III.

ST. JOHN *begins the day as the Romans did; but his hours are not Roman, but Asiatic.*

* DR. CLARKE, and since him our authors in general, who maintain that ST. JOHN reckoned the hours after this method, consider it as the *Roman method*. Such it is admitted to be by their learned opponent † Dr. LARDNER; and so it had been called before by Monf. TOINARD and Monf. LE CLERC. The probable source of this mistake I shall point out elsewhere. But a mistake it undoubtedly is. We find the very same mode of counting the hours that the Jews used, in the works of all the Romans, in prose and verse, in historical and philosophical compositions, as well as in popular orations and familiar epistles.

However ST. JOHN so far agrees with them, that he parts one day from another AT MIDNIGHT: in which he differs from the usage of the Jews who divided them AT SUNSET. And this circumstance renders it more credible, that he has receded from their computation in his hours.

The commencement of his day was observed and argued by the late ‡ Dr. BENSON from the following passage:

John xx. 19. *Then the SAME DAY at evening, being the FIRST day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came JESUS and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.*

This appearance of CHRIST which, ST. JOHN says, *was on the FIRST DAY of the week*, that is, on the evening of the Re-

* Clarke's Paraphrase, note on Mark xv. 25.

† Remarks on Dr. Ward's Dissertations, p. 30—40.

‡ History of the first planting of the Christian Religion. Appendix, N°. iv. p. 52.

surrection,

urrection, happened presently after the return of the two disciples from *Emmaus*, as we learn from Luke xxiv. 13—36. *At what time of the evening did they then return?* For on this the argument depends. Dr. LARDNER thinks it was before sunset; in which case here is no proof that ST. JOHN's civil day ended later than that of the Jews: for till the sun was gone down, there is no dispute that it was the *first* day of the week, whether he began the *second* in the evening or at midnight. But Dr. BENSON judged it so clear a point, that the two disciples did not come back to the Apostles from *Emmaus*, till the sun was set, that he has taken it for granted. And certainly the much greater probability is on this side of the question. For before they had reached *Emmaus* they began to press our LORD travelling with them under the appearance of a stranger to abide with them; because, as they said, "*It was towards evening, and the day was far spent.*" * I know that the Sacred Writers under the notion of evening sometimes include great part of the afternoon; but if that had been ST. LUKE's intention here, he would have put the word into another form: for when afternoon is begun, who that would speak with propriety says, *It is towards afternoon*, and not rather, *It is afternoon?* To determine and limit the sense of the word EVENING it is added, "*And the day is far spent, or, the day is declined:*" not, † "*the day is beginning to decline,*" as he says in another place, when yet, "*The day was far spent,*" as ST. MARK tells us in the parallel passage. It was therefore hastening towards sunset when they entered the village, "*And he went in to tarry with them.*" There a repast was prepared, to which they sat down. And

* The word, under which the Evangelists comprehend a considerable space before, as well as after, sunset, is ὀψις. And this indeed is St. John's word in the verse quoted from him; but St. Luke's is ἑσπρας; by which, if he use it here as in the two other places where he uses it again, Acts iv. 3. xxviii. 3. he must mean the time which begins at sunset: and this is the proper notion of the word. See Macrob. Saturnal. B. i. C. iii. towards the end. ἑσπρας μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ μετὰ τὴν δύσιν τοῦ ἡλίου ὥρα. Himerius in Wetstein on Matth. xxviii. 1. V. i. p. 544.

† Compare the expression here with ch. ix. ver. 12. and that with Mark vi. 35. in the original.

when he had made himself known to them, and disappeared, they had *seven miles and a half* to walk back to *Jerusalem*. Let any indifferent person then judge, whether it is likely they had done all this, met with the Apostles and related the particulars of their story to them before the sun was gone down. On the other hand there is a great probability that the Apostles themselves, whom they found gathered together, did not assemble, till the dusk of the evening rendered their meeting less observable, * as they were in fear of danger or insult from the Jews. But if *they* assembled, or *the two disciples* returned after sunset, then the appearance of CHRIST to them was on the *second* day of the week according to Jewish time, and ST. JOHN, who reckons it to the *first*, must have followed a different method of computing.

But what led him to differ thus from them? If the question related only to a different beginning of the day, we might reply that he followed the Roman division of it. But how are we to account for his hours, which are as little Roman as Jewish? I will answer this difficult question as well as I am able.

I conceive then that he met with them in the district of *Asia Minor* that contained the Seven Churches: in which country the learned in succession might have received a notion of them from the †astronomers who had flourished at *Miletus*. And in the time of ALEXANDER the Great, when the Asiatic Greeks regulated their year by the *Macedonian*, this reformation of the hours might take place in some of their cities. And whether *Ephesus* was one of them or not, ST. JOHN might encourage the Christians there to receive it; as a different beginning of the day would in some observances a little distinguish between them and the Jews, and lead the Jewish converts by a very gentle transition from old things to new. It would also avoid a little incongruity in the celebration of Easter. If they began their

* *For fear of the Jews.*] *Causa redditur, cur cœtus habuerint nocturnos, et cur clausis januis.* Grot. in loc.

† Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, were of *Miletus*.

day at sunset, like the Jews, their Paschal fast, corresponding to the time which our SAVIOUR lay in the grave, would end too soon; and the festival of Easter must anticipate the hour in which he arose. But if they made midnight the boundary between the two days, the festival of course would commence the next morning; and the Resurrection would be aptly and properly commemorated after the hour in which it took place.

These Asian churches, till the council of *Nice*, adhered to the rule of keeping Easter at the full of the vernal moon, in whatever part of the week it fell. In which point they differed from the general practice of the Christian world. Their plea was, that they followed the institution of ST. JOHN. * And as the fact is well attested, it is an argument, that he was not inattentive to regulations of this nature.

THAT such a method of counting the hours as we have proved ST. JOHN's to be, obtained in one part of *Asia Minor*, I think evident from † the celebrated Epistle of the church of *Smyrna*, concerning the martyrdom of their bishop ST. POLYCARP, written about the middle of the second century, and addressed to the church of *Philadelphia*. In this Epistle they relate, that he suffered on the second day of the month Xanthicus (‡ March the 26th, as USHER and PEARSON determine) ABOUT THE EIGHTH HOUR. Now the circumstances of the narrative show, that this EIGHTH HOUR could be no other than eight in the morning. He had retired from the city first to one village and then to another; whither a party of horse was sent to apprehend him. § They left *Smyrna* between three and four in the afternoon, and arrived "about the close of the evening;" as it was at the vernal equinox, I suppose about seven. They had

* Eusebius, B. v. C. xxiv. Irenæi Fragmenta at the end of his works, p. 464. Ed. Grabe.

† See an account of it in Archbishop Wake's Preliminary Discourse to the Translation of the Apostolical Fathers, p. 59. and in Ruinart's Acta Martyrum, p. 28. fol.

‡ Usher De Anno Macedon. C. iii. Pearson De Prim. Romæ Episcopis, Dissert. ii. C. xviii.

§ Hora ipsius cænæ egressi sunt. Ruinart.

therefore

therefore been three hours and an half on the road. Their stay in the village might be as long; as they had a search to make after him, were entertained in the house where they found him, and allowed him two hours for his devotions. They then set him on an ass, and began their journey back. And if we suppose them to have travelled twice as slow with a very old man thus mounted, they would yet arrive soon after it was day-light, between five and six in the morning. When they reached *Smyrna* the chief officer met them, and conducted him immediately before the proconsul into the public place, where a large multitude was got together, in expectation of his coming, and eager for his destruction. The conversation between the proconsul and him was not long. He declared his name, professed his faith and a resolution of never forsaking it. And then it was quickly determined, that he should be burnt alive: "*which was done, says the Letter, with greater speed than it was spoken.*" THE EIGHTH HOUR therefore when he suffered could not be *two* in the afternoon, but must have been *eight* in the morning.

We need not be surprized at finding the people assembled in the public place so early. It was an usual time of beginning the shows and spectacles in these hot climates. * HEROD AGRIPPA was in the theatre at *Cæsarea* as soon as it was day, and was making an oration when the sun rose; the reflection of which from his "*royal apparel*" all covered with silver was so splendid as to dazzle and astonish the beholders, and excite the prophane acclamations, of which both † ST. LUKE, and JOSEPHUS take notice. ‡ PHILO JUDÆUS has another instance of the early concourse of the people in the theatre: for in relating the persecution of the Jews by the Alexandrians, he says, *That the spectacles first exhibited from EARLY IN THE MORNING even to the third or fourth hour were the Jews, scourged, suspended, tormented, condemned, and led to death through the middle of the*

* Josephus. Antiq. B. xix. C. viii. §. 2.

† Acts xii. 22.

‡ Philo in Flaccum, V. ii. p. 529. Ed. Mangey.

orchestra.

orchestra. The words of PHILO intimate, that the fourth was a late hour for the continuance of such cruel entertainments, and that commonly they gave place before that time to more festive amusements.

* About eighty four years after the martyrdom of POLYCARP, PIONIUS suffered the same death at *Smyrna*. He suffered, as the acts of his martyrdom mention, *on the iv before the ides of March according to the Roman calendar, but on the xi of the seventh month according to the Asiatic, at THE TENTH HOUR*. As the Roman magistrates sat in judgement in the morning, often very early, and the sentence on PIONIUS was executed without delay, it is not credible that his death was deferred to *four* in the afternoon; it was therefore at *ten* in the morning; and yields another proof that the people of *Smyrna* reckoned as we do. And if they and a few other Asiatic cities varied from the rest of *Asia*, it was a peculiarity for the better, and not so extraordinary, as that the citizens of *Nuremberg* should disagree with the Germans round them for the worse: † for their clocks strike the hours after the method of the ancients.

It is no wonder, if they who had scarce an idea of other hours than such as were used in *Italy* and *Greece*, and used also in the country where ST. JOHN was bred, took it for granted, that he all along retained them, and therefore overlooked the marks he has given of another method of counting them.

* Ruinart *Acta Martyrum*, p. 137. fol. Pionius suffered at the same hour in which Fructuosus bishop of Tarragon was executed. *Ib.* p. 219.

† Keysser's Travels, Letter 92d. near the beginning.

DISCOURSE THE EIGHTH.

PART THE SECOND.

THE HOURS OF THE ROMANS AND OF SOME OTHER
ANCIENT NATIONS CONSIDERED.

✓ **I**T will probably appear questionable, whether so many learned men could be mistaken, as have supposed the method in which *we* reckon the hours to have been a Roman method. I will here therefore show, how the fact is: and if any should think I over-prove it, my excuse must be, that it seemed necessary to oppose full evidence to great authorities; and that I do it not for such as are versed in the subject, but for those who have not attended to it.

* The Romans called the time between the rising and setting sun the *natural* day, and the time of the whole four and twenty hours the *civil* day. The civil day they began and ended at midnight; and derived this practice † from their ancient jurisprudence and rites of religion established long before they had any idea of hours. According to ‡ VARRO, the first sun-dial

* Naturalis dies est tempus ab oriente sole ad solis occasum; cujus contrarium tempus est nox, ab occasu solis usque ad exortum. Civilis autem dies vocatur tempus quod fit uno cæli circumactu, quo dies verus et nox continetur. Censorinus de Die natali, C. xxiii. See also Plin. Hist. B. ii. C. lxxix. Hardouin.

Aldus and others of the moderns reverse the application of these terms, and call the whole four and twenty hours the *natural* day. Aldus on Palladius. Libri de Re Rustica. Paris. 1533. p. 504.

† Censorinus, C. xxiii. Macrobian. Saturnal. B. i. C. iii.

‡ Censorin. ib. Plin. Nat. Hist. B. vii. C. lx.

seen at *Rome* was brought from *Catana* in *Sicily* as part of the spoils of this city in the first Punic war. It was set up unskillfully in the *Forum*, and did not answer exactly to the latitude of the place; yet was the only measure of hours which they had for ninety nine years, when matters began to be better ordered. Thus therefore they learnt the division of hours, which ever afterwards they followed, from a dial of *Greek* construction. But the Greeks divided the natural day into twelve hours; which, as * *HERODOTUS* informs us, they were taught by the Babylonians. Accordingly the dials on the tower of *ANDRONICUS CYRRHESTES* were so constructed, † “*That the longest as well as shortest days are divided alike into twelve hours:*” and these, it is evident, were numbered from sunrising.

Such were the hours of ‡ *POLYBIUS* in the time of the Roman republic; of § *PLUTARCH* and other Greek authors under the emperors; and such they continued at Constantinople, when the Western empire was no more. || In the seventh century one of the Greek emperors, *CONSTANTINUS POGONATUS*, as is commonly reputed, compiled a book on agriculture, in which, describing the course of the moon, he plainly divides the day and night into twelve hours each. By these hours is the ancient Epigram to be explained, which tells us, That *six hours well suffice for labour, but the next following, pointed out by the letters, say to men, Live*, ΖΗΘΙ. For the letters of ΖΗΘΙ, as signs of number, are the *seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth*; that is, the four hours following noon, which was the *sixth*:

* Ἐξ ὥραι μόχθοις ἰκανώταται· αἱ δὲ μετ' αὐτὰς,
Γράμμασι δεικνύμεναι, ΖΗΘΙ λέγουσι βροτοῖς.

* Herod. B. ii. C. cix.

† Antiquities of Athens, by Stuart and Revett, C. iii. plate x, xi.

‡ See Book i. about the middle, where he describes the entrance of Hannibal the Rhodian into Lilybæum Περὶ περὶ τὴν ἀγέαν.

§ See particularly, Life of Sylla, p. 87. 97. Ed. Bryan.

|| Geoponic. L. i. C. vii. p. 10. Ed. Needham. Cantab. 1704.

* Epigram. Græc. L. i. p. 169. Basil. 1549. fol.

The Romans therefore, as imitators of the Greeks, divided the natural day into twelve hours, and reckoned them after the same manner. The hours of one day were equal to each other, but unequal to the hours of another day at any distance; * and the diurnal hours were much longer in summer than winter. We may therefore stile them *unequal* hours to distinguish them from the modern, which are always of the same length.

A variety of examples is here collected from authors who lived in different ages of the Roman empire, and treated of very different subjects, to prove, not so much that this was a method, as that it was the only method, of marking the time of day received among them.

Si te grata quies et PRIMAM somnus in horam
Delectat. Hor. L. i. Epist. xvii. ver. 6.

— Ante SECUNDAM

Roscius orabat, sibi adesses ad Puteal cras.
Id. L. ii. Sat. vi. ver. 34.

In like manner CICERO,

Ut ad tabulam Sextiam sibi adsint hora secunda.
Orat. pro P. Quintio, §. 6.

Hora secunda calceos poscit. Plin. Epist. L. iii. Ep. i.

In oppido Pistoriensi prope horam diei TERTIAM spectantibus multis asinus tribunali ascenso audiebatur destinationis rugiens. Ammian. Marcellin. L. xxvii. C. iii.

Exercet raucos tertia caufidicos. Martial. L. iv. Ep. viii.

See this whole Epigram for an account of the Roman day and hours.

Ipse [Cæsar] hora circiter diei QUARTA cum primis navibus Britanniam attigit. De Bell. Gall. L. iv. C. xxiii.

* Hora nec æstiva est, nec tibi tota perit. Martial. L. xii. Ep. i.
Hæc enim ad infinitam ætatem non sunt brumalis unius instar horæ.

Cenforinus, C. xvi.

Inde ubi quarta sitim cœli collegerit hora.

Virg. Georg. iii. ver. 327.

Stertimus, indomitum quod despumare Falernum

Sufficiat, QUINTA dum linea tangitur umbra.

Perfius Sat. iii. ver. 4.

Tunc horas requirenti pro quinta, quam metuebat, sexta ex industria nunciata est. Sueton. in Domitiano. C. xvi.

Cum in *Berenice*, quam primam posuimus, ipso die solstitii SEXTA hora umbræ in totum absumentur.

Plin. Nat. Hist. L. vi. C. xxxiv.

PLINY is here speaking of a place under the tropic of Cancer, where on the day of the summer solstice the sun being vertical at the sixth hour, or noon, there was no shadow.

Hora quasi SEPTIMA cunctatus est an ad prandium surgeret.

Sueton. in C. Caligula. C. lviii.

The *prandium* was a repast commonly taken at noon, which the same author in the Life of AUGUSTUS, C. lxxviii. calls *cibum meridianum*.

Ante horam OCTAVAM in publico neminem nisi ægrum lavari passus est. Ælius Spartian. in Adriano Cæsare. Hist.

Aug. Script. V. i. p. 196.

NONA submissum rotat hora solem,

Partibus vixdum tribus evolutis,

Quarta devexo superest in axe

Portio lucis.

Aurel. Prudentii Cathemerinôn Lib. Hymn. viii.

p. 34. Ed. Elzevir.

The ancients distributed the night into four parts, and the day into as many. [Censorin. C. xxiii.] With reference to this division PRUDENTIUS says, that at the *ninth* hour three portions

DISCOURSE VIII. PART II. 245

tions of the day were past, and a fourth remained. The times of this and the sixth hour are so defined, that they might determine the others, if any of them could be doubted.

Cum hora diei DECIMA fere ad Saxa Rubra venisset, delituit in quadam cauponula, &c. Cic. Philippic. ii. §. 31.

Id oriebatur circa UNDECIMAM horam diei. AUGUSTUS CÆSAR, apud Plin. Nat. Hist. L. ii. C. xxiii.

AUGUSTUS is here speaking of the Comet, that was seen after the death of JULIUS CÆSAR. SÆTONIUS and SENECA give the same account of the time of its appearance :

Exoriens circa undecimam horam.

Suet. in Julio. C. lxxxviii.

Qui post necem Divi Julii ludis Veneris genetricis circa undecimam horam diei emerfit.

Sen. Nat. Quæst. L. vii. C. 17.

O Rex, DUODECIMA hora ædificare incipis.

Ω βασιλεῦ, δωδεκάτης ὥρας ἀποδομεῖν ἀρχῇ.

Plutarch. Vit. M. Crassi. V. iii. p. 270. Ed. Bryan.

They are the words of MARCUS CRASSUS to king DEIOTARUS, who in a very advanced age was building a city.

The *twelfth* hour rarely occurs, because the time of it generally retained its ancient and natural name of sunset. For the coincidence of Roman with modern hours was, at the equinoxes when it was compleat, as in this scheme ; in which the ancient hours stand above.

Sunrising. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. or sunset.

vi. vii. viii. ix. x. xi. xii. i. ii. iii. iv. v. vi. modern hours.

The sixth hour being always noon, the truth of this scheme seems evident on inspection, but may be thus proved.

PALLADIUS,

PALLADIUS, *De re rustica*, gives the countryman a calendar of hours, and teaches him to distinguish them in every month of the year by the length of shadow projected by a certain perpendicular pole. This shadow decreases from the first to the sixth, when it is shortest, and then increases again. At the *first* hour in the morning and *eleventh* in the afternoon he makes it always equal. But the *eleventh* was an hour before sunset, as the parable of the labourers in ST. MATTHEW shows, Ch. xx. 9—12. The *first* therefore was an hour after the sun rose. And when PLINY directs, that apples in autumn should not be gathered *Ante horam primam*, Nat. Hist. B. xv. C. xviii. he means, till they have had an hour's sun upon them.—Perhaps all this proof was not very necessary. However it has helped us to an authority which may be of further use.

Such was the distribution of the day into hours, which prevailed universally and from first to last among the Romans. And the authors who imagine them to have agreed with the moderns in this point, seem to have been led into the mistake by concluding too hastily, that they began to count their hours from the commencement of their civil day, which was midnight. Midnight with them was not the *twelfth* but *sixth* hour of the night: as is certain by the testimonies of AULUS GELLIUS, *Noctes Atticæ*, B. iii. C. ii. and MACROBIUS, *Saturnal.* B. i. C. iii. *Diem quem Romani civilem appellaverint a SEXTA noctis hora oriri.* And these words at the same time show, how the nocturnal hours were reckoned; which else it were easy to prove by another set of examples.

We find indeed *equal* hours mentioned, and in particular cases employed by their authors: but the use of them was no more Roman than Greek or Egyptian, and obtained only where *unequal* hours could not answer the purpose, as in astronomical calculations, and in comparing the length of days in different seasons and climates. On this occasion, and on this only, we meet with them in some passages of PLINY, who there distinguishes them, as the Greeks did also, by the name of *equinoctial* hours.

On

On the same occasion we find them again in the * *Kalendarium rusticum Romanum*. But in marking the time of day the Roman writers of agriculture agree with their countrymen, as we have seen by PALLADIUS.

The Romans were not singular in beginning the day and hours at different times. In *Egypt* the day commenced at midnight, but the hours in the morning. † The clock invented by CTESIBIUS was so contrived as to lengthen or shorten the hours. They were therefore ὥραι καίρικαι, *hours that varied with the season*. ‡ PTOLEMY the astronomer marks the time of the same phenomenon by these as well as equal hours, that he may accomodate himself to the usage of his country. And because the people had a difficulty of conceiving, that any day could have more or less than twelve hours, § ACHILLES TATIUS takes some pains to explain the matter to them, and to show how the same day might have *twelve* hours of one sort and *fifteen* of another. CTESIBIUS, PTOLEMY, ACHILLES TATIUS, and other authors who compute in the same manner, were of *Alexandria*. And the proper Egyptians as well as Greeks of this city must have been strangers to the common use of equal hours: else the inhabitants in general would have understood the nature of them, and not wanted the illustration which TATIUS has given.

* This Calendar is published in the works of Goltzius, Vol. i. Thesaur. Rei Antiquar. p. 205. It is published also in Vol. viii. of Grævius' Roman Antiquities. It was calculated for the meridian of *Rome*, and places the WHEAT HARVEST about the middle of August, which now ends much earlier. This favours the hypothesis of a learned and ingenious Author, who supposes that the seasons there are milder than they were in the time of the Romans. See, *An Investigation of the Difference between the present Temperature of the Air in Italy and some other Countries, and what it was seventeen Centuries ago*. By the Honourable DAINES BARRINGTON, F.R.S. *Philos. Transactions*, Vol. lviii. p. 58.

Palladius indeed says under July, B. viii. Tit. i. *Nunc locis temperatis tritici messis expletur*. Still I apprehend, that the wheat harvest was later in ancient Italy, whatever the cause may be, than it is in the modern; and that two degrees at least north of Rome, the wheat harvest is now over, *locis temperatis*, by the end of June.

† It is described by Vitruvius, B. ix. towards the end.

‡ Ptol. Μεγάλη Σύνοψις, L. vii. C. iii.

§ Ifagoge ad Arati Phænom. C. xxv, in the Uranologium of Dionys. Petavius, p. 149.

The

The hours were the same as at *Rome* in the Roman provinces of *Afric* and *Spain*. * TERTULLIAN an inhabitant of *Carthage* mentions the *third*, *sixth*, and *ninth* hours, *ut insigniores in rebus humanis, quæ diem distinguunt, quæ publice resonant*. For explication of which words RIGALTIIUS on the place quotes a passage from VARRO, *De ling. Latin*, L. v. which tells us, that an officer called ACCENSUS used by order of the Prætor to proclaim the third hour, mid-day, and the ninth hour.

In *Spain*, † when FRUCTUOSUS bishop of *Tarragon* and his two deacons EULOGIUS and AUGURIUS were led to be burnt in the Amphitheatre, their friends in kindness offered them a cup of spiced wine, which FRUCTUOSUS refused, saying, *It was not yet time to break his fast*: for, says the relater of his martyrdom, *It was about the FOURTH hour of the day*, or ten in the morning. This was A. D. CCLIX.

WANDELBERTUS, a Benedictine monk of *Prumia*, a monastery in the country of *Triers*, about the middle of the ninth century ‡ published a poem on the method of constructing a dial; in which, agreeing exactly with PALLADIUS, he tells us at what hours of the forenoon and afternoon the shadows correspond, and that the shadow of the *sixth hour* only has none to answer it:

Menſe omni prima undecimæ conjungitur horæ;
Hinc umbris decimam neſtit curſuque ſecunda;
Tertia mox nonam punctis complectitur iſdem.
Octavæ pariter præcedens quarta cohæret.
Quintam ſubſequitur numero poſt ſeptima juſto.
Sola ſuas tantum menſuras ſEXTA retentat.

It is very evident that he here lays down the Roman or unequal hours; and we may conclude he describes such as were

* De Jejuniiis, C. x. p. 349. Ed. Rigaltii. See also Cyprian De Oratione Dominica, p. 154. Ed. Fell.

† Ruinart Acta Martyrum, p. 220. fol.

‡ Printed by Pithæus at Geneva, A. D. 1596. in a book intitled, Epigrammata et Poematia vetera.

used by the nations round the place of his residence, Franks, Germans, and Flemish. The people of our Island probably agreed with those of the continent. Our countryman BEDE was formerly reputed the author of the poem.

I believe indeed, that for some ages these hours prevailed universally in the Western empire. They still maintain their station in the * rubrics of the Latin church, which order the mass to be said on some occasions, post primam diei; on others, hora tertia, or hora sexta, or post nonam.

But otherwise the people of *Rome* and of *Italy* in general have changed the form of their hours: of which we have an instance in a † passage which I find cited from a brief of Pope ALEXANDER the fifth, A. D. 1409. “Annis singulis in vigilia festivitatis resurrectionis Dominicæ, hora diei VIGESIMA TERTIA vel circa, una missa solenniter decantari consueverit.” The method in which the hours are here reckoned, was introduced among them, ‡ as we are told, in the thirteenth century; and to this they still adhere. They do not stop at twelve, but count the hours on to four and twenty; and make the day end about half an hour after the sun is gone down. This scheme avoids the inequality of Roman hours, but has unsettled the hour of NOON, which is in perpetual fluctuation. At *Rome* in the depth of winter it is the nineteenth hour, but at midsummer the sixteenth: and between the solstices every minute of the 16th, 17th, and 18th hours lights in its turn upon the point of mid-day. We may therefore justly prefer the regulation received in our own and other nations, as uniting the benefits of the Roman and Italian methods without the disadvantages of either. We have equal hours with the Italians, and noon always at a certain hour as the Romans had.

But whether this more philosophic method was brought from any part of *Asia* into the Western and Northern regions of *Eu-*

* Missale Romanum. De hora celebrandi Missam. Rubric. xv.

† See under Missa vespertina Carpentier's Appendix to Du Fresne's Glossary.

‡ Thesaurus sacrorum rituum, Romæ 1738. Tom. ii. pars i. C. iv. note i. p. 215.

rope; or whether, because increase of latitude increases the disparity between summer and winter hours upon the old plan, the inconvenience of it to northerly nations put them on contriving a better; and when and where this *new stile* of hours was first introduced; these are inquiries which I leave to the learned and curious.

THE END.

5 DE60

CT

